The Catholic Biblical Quarterly

Volume VI, Number 4

October, 1944

Published by

THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL QUARTERLY

EDITORIAL STAFF

Rev. Michael Gruenthaner, S.J., S.S.D., *Editor in Chief*
Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

Rev. Wendell S. Reilly, S.S., S.S.D.
St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Md.

Rev. William H. McClellan, S.J., S.T.D.
Woodstock College, Woodstock, Md.

Rev. Louis Hartmann, C.Ss.R., S.S.L., Ling.Or.L.
Mt. St. Alphonsus, Esopus, N. Y.

Rev. Joseph J. Lilly, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.
Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

Rev. John P. Weisengoff, S.T.D., S.S.L.
Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

Rev. John J. Dougherty, S.T.L., S.S.L.
Immaculate Conception Seminary, Darlington, N. J.

Rev. Cyril Gaul, O.S.B., *Publishing Editor*
St. Meinrad Seminary, St. Meinrad, Ind.

THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL QUARTERLY is published in January, April, July, and October, by THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION, Cum Permissu Superiorum.

All communications regarding articles should be addressed to THE EDITOR-IN-CHIEF, The Catholic Biblical Quarterly, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

The subscription price is $4.00 the year; single copies $1.25.

THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL QUARTERLY is indexed in *The Catholic Periodical Index.*

"Entered as second class matter at the post office at Washington, D. C. Additional entry as second class matter at the post office at St. Meinrad, Indiana."

Address all communications of a business character to
THE CATHOLIC BIBLICAL ASSOCIATION
The Catholic University of America
Washington 17, D. C.

CONTENTS

Letter of the Apostolic Delegate 389

Historical Parallels to Patriarchal Social Custom 391
Rev. Roger T. O'Callahan, S.J.

The Rider on the White Horse 406
Rev. J. S. Considine, O.P., S.T.Lr.

The Gospel for the Feast of the Guardian Angels 423
Rev. John J. Collins, S.J., S.S.L.

Who is the Boy in Isaias 7:16? 435
Rev. Thomas E. Bird, D.D., Ph.D.

"Non Gustabunt Mortem" 444
Rev. Anthony C. Cotter, S.J., S.T.D.

St. Augustine's Defense of the Hexaemeron
Against the Manicheans 456
Rev. John P. Maher, O.S.A., S.T.L.

Job 12:7-9 and the Knowability of God 476
Rev. Antonine DeGuglielmo, O.F.M., S.T.D.

Missal Epistles from Romans, XVI 483
Rev. Joseph L. Lilly, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.

Correspondence 489

Biblical News 492

Survey of Periodicals 494

Book Reviews 500

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/catholic-biblical-quarterly_1944-10_6_4

APOSTOLIC DELEGATION
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

3339 Massachusetts Avenue
WASHINGTON, D. C.

August 18, 1944

His Excellency,
The Most Reverend Edwin V. O'Hara, D.D.
Chairman, Episcopal Committee
Confraternity of Christian Doctrine
St. Mary's College
Notre Dame, Indiana

Your Excellency,

I wish to express my cordial thanks for the information that the members of the Catholic Biblical Association of America will meet at St. Mary's College, Notre Dame, Indiana on August 22nd and 23rd, in connection with their work of translating the Old Testament from the original languages into English. This news is a source of great pleasure, since the deep learning which forms the background of their work, and their well-known devotion to the Holy See are already in themselves auguries of success in the monumental work to which they have so resolutely set themselves.

The Supreme Pontiffs have, especially in recent times, encouraged scholars to consecrate their best efforts to the sacred and apostolic work of interpreting the Word of God and presenting it to the laity in translations as clear as the difficulty of the matter and the limitations of human knowledge permit. In his Encyclical of September 30, 1943, Divino Afflante Spiritu, His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, refers to this as a great and noble work and states: "Let all know that this prolonged labor is not only necessary for the right understanding of the divinely given writings, but also is urgently demanded by that piety by which it behooves us to be grateful to the God of all providence, who from the throne of His majesty has sent these books as so many personal letters to His own children."

Comformably to the recommendations of His Holiness, the members of the Catholic Biblical Association are laudably engaged in translating the Old Testament from the original languages for the use of the laity. The magnitude and importance of this undertaking should elicit the interest, sympathetic understanding, and aid, as far as possible, of both clergy and laity. The difficulty of this noble work arises from the very nature of things. Each language has its own proper genius and idioms. The difficulty is enhanced when the translator is dealing with ancient languages such as biblical Hebrew and Greek. The books of the Old Testament were composed in

centuries long since past, and all of us are well aware how distances of time and divergences of custom can be obstacles to the acquisition of adequate knowledge of the events and of the language and manner in which they are narrated. Not infrequently the simple fact of translation must be an interpretation. Hence, perfection cannot be demanded, and no translation can ever hope to win the unreserved approval of every scholar. In the light of modern findings in the fields of archaeology and philology, the divine message of the Scriptures is constantly being set forth with ever greater clarity.

In the face of all these various problems, we cannot but think with filial gratitude of the words of our Holy Father himself in his masterful Encyclical on the study of Sacred Scripture: "Let all the sons of the church," writes His Holiness, "bear in mind that the efforts of these resolute laborers in the vineyard of the Lord should be judged not only with equity and justice, but also with the greatest charity; all moreover should abhor that intemperate zeal which imagines that whatever is new should for that very reason be opposed or suspected."

The profound and painstaking studies of the members of the Biblical Association engaged in this work of translation, their mutual consultation and discussions, and the learned revision of the Most Reverend members of the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, will be of untold value in the great task which lies ahead. Together with the devotion to the Word of God which animates them, a devotion nurtured by priestly piety and tireless study, these great qualities are pledges of successful work for the glory of God and the salvation of souls.

I should have been most happy to accept the gracious invitation of Your Excellency to open this meeting by celebrating Holy Mass, were it not that present occupations made this acceptance impossible. Nevertheless, it is my wish to comply in some measure with this kind invitation, and it is for this reason that I wish to express in this letter my admiration for these biblical scholars and their work, while uniting my prayers to theirs for the success of their labors.

With sentiments of esteem and with every best wish for God's blessing and guidance on the work of this meeting I remain

Sincerely yours in Christ,
(signed) A. G. Cicognani
Archbishop of Laodicea
Apostolic Delegate

HISTORICAL PARALLELS TO PATRIARCHAL SOCIAL CUSTOM*

REV. ROGER T. O'CALLAHAN, S.J.

It is now almost equivalent to repeating a commonplace to assert that archaeological findings in the ancient Near East within the last century have added to our knowledge of the historical, cultural and indeed, to no small extent, even of the religious background of the Old Testament a richness and depth hitherto neither possessed nor even suspected. If one considers how generously the earth has yielded up its treasures of biblical lore, from the year 1838, when Edward Robinson first began his surface survey of the Holy Land, a territory limited enough, up until the present day, when accumulated finds now present an all-embracing picture from the Nile to the Euphrates, from the year 4000 B.C. and earlier to the Christian era, one is staggered to think what great poverty such good fortune has relieved. Nor need it be said that perhaps the richest fruits of such patient labors have been won within the last twenty-five years—in fact, with such surprising rapidity that, although our world at war seems bent on removing most of the traces of its present civilization from the eyes of future historians, still the halt it necessarily calls to the activities of the archaeologist is all too brief a respite for the measured assimilation of its remote past as guarded in these latest gains. And yet, as these latter discoveries, both inscriptional and mute, are duly deciphered and interpreted, they will fit literally stone by stone into the admirable mosaic that one day, we hope, will place the ancient world before our eyes and show forth more fully the setting God chose for the giving of His inspired word to man.

* Note the following abbreviations: AASOR, *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research;* ASAW, *Abhandlungen der sächs. Akademie der Wissenschaften;* BA, *The Biblical Archaeologist;* FSAC, *From the Stone Age to Christianity* by W. F. Albright (Baltimore: 1940); HSS, *Harvard Semitic Series;* JAOS, *Journal of the American Oriental Society;* JBL, *The Journal of Biblical Literature;* RA, *Revue d'Assyriologie;* RB, *Revue Biblique;* RHR, *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions;* ZA, *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.*

THE SECOND MILLENNIUM B.C.

Even now the picture takes on definite outline. It will not be amiss at this point to hint at some of the more obvious and outstanding contributions of archaeology in this respect. If we turn our thoughts to the second millenium B.C., the splendid array of texts, statuettes, varied artifacts and time-telling potsherds that have come to us from Cappadocia in the 19th century B.C., from Mari before the 18th century B.C., from Nuzi in the 15th, from Ras-Shamra in the 15th, and from Tell el-Amarna in the 14th centuries B.C., not to mention other important discoveries, provides us with an ample and rich background in which to set our biblical story. Nor is it exaggerated to affirm that these discoveries will in the future have a value every bit as great as our present knowledge of them is small, no matter how advanced the latter may be. Yet even now, the first obvious conclusion that springs to mind is the fact that never again can one claim with Wellhausen that Israel was a spiritually isolated people, since archaeology shows what a late-comer on the scene of history Israel really was.[1] Again, we now know that alphabetic writing well antedated Moses' time, going back most probably to the late 19th century B.C., as shown by the Proto-Sinaitic inscriptions,[2] and hence that early biblical references to writing, such as are found in Jdgs. 5:14 and 8:14, merit full acceptance. The Cappadocian texts[3] from modern Kültepe in eastern Anatolia reveal the busy doings of a far flung Assyrian trading post and bid fair to become a chief source for our knowledge of the ancient Amorite religion. Mari, on the upper Euphrates, with its more than twenty thousand tablets, needs only to name more than thirty kings and their capitals throughout and beyond the Fertile Crescent from Crete to Susa as trade correspondents, and almost by the same token, to enumerate more than twenty-four deities incorporated into its own pantheon from far and near to convince the most unyielding sceptic of how racially diverse, commercially advanced and religiously syncretistic was the cultural

[1] J. Coppens, *The Old Testament and the Critics* (Paterson, N. J.: 1942), p. 69.

[2] J. W. Flight, "History of Writing in the Near East," p. 115 ff. in *The Haverford Symposium on Archaeology and the Bible* (New Haven: 1938).

[3] J. Lewy, "Les textes paléo-assyriens et l'ancien Testament" in RHR, 1934, p. 28 ff.

background against which the patriarchs played their role in history.[4] It is Mari, too, which with the words: *'išâtam našûm:* to raise fire, teaches us that such a manner of giving signals in time of military or political need is very ancient, and so undeniably makes for the better understanding of the משאת found in Jer. 6:1 (σημεῖον—LXX; *vexillum*—Vg.) and in Jdgs. 20:40 (πυρσός . . . στῦλος καπνοῦ—LXX; *quasi columnam ignis*—Vg.) and also found in the fourth of the Lachish letters. Of Nuzi we shall have occasion to speak later. One of the most signal contributions of the mythological texts from Ras Shamra is the light they shed on Canaanite religion not too long before the Israelite invasion of Palestine. It is polytheistic, gross and quite sunken at this time. The gods[5] Dagon, El and Baal, the goddesses, bloodlusting Anat, Asherah and Astarte of the fertility cult parade before us and help to throw into vivid relief the energetic stand taken later in the 9th century B.C. by the prophet Elias in the name of Yahweh against Asherah and the prophets of Baal (3 Kgs. 18). Linguistically, Ugaritic, the language of these texts, has already begun to broaden our knowledge of the Northwest-Semitic tongues from both the morphological and semantic points of view, and through its many parallels in word and idiom, either to open up for the first time or to shade considerably the meaning of many poetic and prophetic parts of the Bible.[6] In the Amarna letters from Egypt we are given tangible proof that long before our 20th century, the affairs and fates of countries are inextricably bound up one with another, and it may well be that the history of the Hebrews will be considerably illumined one day by their final identification with the *Khapiru,*[7] those roving raid-

[4] A. Bea, "Die Texte von Mari und das Alte Testament," *Biblica,* 1940, Vol. 21, p. 191 ff.

[5] It is not impossible that a god by the name Yw (Yaw), was the object of cultic homage in Phoenicia, as contained in the Ugaritic text designated according to Ch. Virolleaud, VI AB, col, IV, l. 14. Whether this name Yw is also to be equated with the biblical Yhwh (Yahweh), is quite another matter. cf. A. Bea, "Archaeologisches und Religionsgeschichliches aus Ugarit-Ras-Schamra," *Biblica,* 1939, Vol. 20, p. 441.

[6] Very instructive in this regard is the latest study by J. H. Patton, *Canaanite Parallels in the Book of Psalms* (Baltimore, 1944).

[7] W. F. Albright, FSAC, pp. 182, 211. The frequently used term *Ḥabiru* is now recognized as a transcribed reflection of *'apiru* (*khapiru*) and represents a simple appellative rather than an ethnic designation, when applied to peoples who play a strange and almost ubiquitous role in cuneiform

ers who give so much cause for complaint to Abdihepa, the local vassal in Jerusalem, in his letters to the Egyptian monarch.

In addition to these varied contributions, the discovery of the ancient law codes, Assyrian, Hittite, Sumerian and especially of Hammurabi, bears witness to the antiquity of Mosaic legislation and archaeology has made quite untenable that position which would maintain that the character of the tabernacle, the altar of incense, the seven-branched candlestick and other matters of religious import are of relatively late introduction.[8] And thus, by way of illustration for the second millennium B.C., could the well-nigh interminable list go on.

THE NUZI DOCUMENTS

In the light of such a broad panorama, even though hastily seen, and of the rich harvest in biblical knowledge that further working of these fertile fields will bring, one is enticed to examine in greater detail what such fruits well may be. For such a purpose a consideration of the Patriarchal Age is excellent, and for its extra-biblical counterpart, one is rewarded most perhaps, by turning to the Nuzi documents, a collection of several thousand cuneiform texts, coming from private archives of families in the two neighboring towns of Nuzi (Yarghan Tepe) and Kirkuk, near the little Zab, and dating back to the 15th century B.C. These texts were discovered mainly by a joint expedition of the American Schools of Oriental Research and the Iraq Museum in 1925 under the direction of Edward Chiera and subsequently by a similar expedition of the Harvard Semitic Museum and the Baghdad School in 1928-31 under the direction of R. H. Pfeiffer

---

documents of the second millenium B.C. Wherever they appear, they seem to be foreigners, not sedentary, nor yet purely bedawin; in old Babylonian texts they are veritable *condottieri*, in Mesopotamia and Syria they are soldiers and freebooters, at Nuzi they are voluntary slaves, and in the Amarna age, as noted, they are raiders and rebels against the Egyptian sovereign. It does not follow that the word *'apiru* itself meant robber, but more probably wanderer. It is becoming more and more the consensus of opinion that the *'apiru* in Palestine are to be identified with the Hebrews and as such represented an advance guard of the Israelite invasion into the land. Thus such an ethnic usage of the term would be a comparatively later development.

[8] W. F. Albright, *Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible* (New York: 1932), p. 155 ff.

and R. F. S. Starr. Thus far, 1200 tablets have been published,[9] while thousands more await their turn. These records present a worthy subject for comprehensive study, since they apply to a restricted area in space and do not exceed a period of one hundred years in time. Until the present, they have been treated with important results from many points of view. From linguistic studies,[10] the native population of Nuzi is now shown to have been largely Hurrian in character, though employing Accadian. From the historical approach,[11] we gain the result that the Hurrians, with whom we must also identify the biblical Horites, formed part of a dominant group of the second millennium B.C. who left their traces in Egypt, Asia Minor, Syria and Mesopotamia, but who then became rapidly Semitized. Juridically speaking,[12] one cannot come, unfortunately, to such clear-cut conclusions, for, although mere exterior court procedure and administration emerge plainly enough, still, because of the private nature of the contracts and the many modifications of time and circumstance necessarily attendant upon them, they cannot by any means be said to constitute a *corpus iuris*. Far from giving the possibility of reconstructing the Nuzi law code, they do not even present a larger generalization of legal transactions as may be gleaned, for example, from the temple dealings in Babylonia. The economic aspects of these texts have also received attention[13] and thus new

[9] G. Contanau, "Les tablettes de Kergouk et les origines de la civilisation assyrienne," Babyloniaca 9. fasc. 2-4; also "Contrats et lettres d'Assyrie et de Babylonie," t. IX Louvre: C. J. Gadd, "Tablets from Kirkuk," RA, XXIII, pp. 49-161; E. Chiera, "Joint Expedition with the Iraq Museum at Nuzi," Vols. I-V, 1927 to 1934; E. R. Lacheman., Vol. VI, 1939, hereafter referred to as N; in the HSS of Nuzi: E. Chiera, Vol. I; R. H. Pfeiffer, Vol. II, T. J. Meek, Vol. III, E. Lacheman and R. H. Pfeiffer, vol. IV; R. Starr, "Nuzi," Harvard Univ. Press, 1937 for Plates (Vol. II), 1939 for Text (Vol. I).

[10] C. Gordon, "The Dialect of the Nuzi Tablets," *Orientalia*, Vol. 7, pp. 32, 315: A. Goetz, "Some Observations on Nuzu Akkadian," *Language*, 14, 134-143, 1938; E. Speiser, "Introduction to Hurrian," AASOR, Vol. XX, 1941.

[11] E. Speiser, "Ethnic Movements in the Near East in the Second Millennium B.C.," AASOR, Vol. XIII, pp. 13-54, 1933.

[12] P. Koschaker, "Neue keilschriftliche Rechtsurkunden aus der El-Amarna Zeit," ASAW, 39, 1928; H. Liebesny, "The Administration of Justice in the Nuzi Tablets," JAOS, Vol. 63, p. 128, Apr.-June, 1943.

[13] D. Cross, *Movable Property in the Nuzi Documents* (Philadelphia: 1937).

light has been shed on Nuzian business practices and standards of exchange.

In greater detail the Nuzi documents comprise: a) family records, e.g., a *mârûtu* document for adoption of a male person, *ahûtu* for brother-hood, *kallatûtu* for marriage, with other terms as *šîmtu,* will, *terḫatu,* bridal price, *riksu,* contract; b) business transactions such as *šupe'ultu* or exchange, *ditennûtu,* possession, and ḪAR-RA "as loan"; c) court proceedings such as *lišânšu,* declaration, *tuppi taḫsilti,* a memorandum for trial by ordeal; d) finally, miscellaneous texts such as inventories, receipts, and the like. It is interesting to note that there is a profusion of documents *ana mârûti:* for adoption into sonship, and a closer study of them reveals that some were real but others only apparent or sale-adoptions. Because of the partly feudal nature of the Nuzi state, it was not permitted to let property, which was held in fief from the ruler, pass beyond a male member of one's own family. Since, however, private possession was or became a *de facto,* if not a *de iure* practice, the law was circumvented by adopting the prospective purchaser as a brother or son. This is clear from the fact that the adopted "child" often presents a *qîštu:* gift, in reality the purchase price to the new parent, and that an *ilku*[14] clause, i.e., of feudal service, is inserted into the contract, two elements, in short, entirely out of place in a real adoption: in fact, in the latter,[15] it is enjoined upon the adopted child what duties he shall perfom towards the adopting parent, and we do not find there anything like the "inheritance" so clearly outlined in the sale-adoptions.

From first impressions it might seem that a consideration of such a people as the Nuzians is little suited to clarify our understanding of the patriarchal times. For these Hurrians are non-

[14] Regarding contracts which have an *ilku* clause, Hildegard Lewy maintains their purpose is not to circumvent the law but rather to ensure greater dependence of the tenant on the crown, inasmuch as he was to hold the land until his own death, upon which it passed into the hands of the adopted son, who was in reality a royal officer, and whose *qîtšu* had in the meantime really represented a royal grant to the feudal tenant. Thus upon the latter's death the land was bound to revert to the crown. Such a view, however, though quite ingenious, is meeting strong opposition, and the theory of sale-adoptions as held by Speiser and Koschaker finds greater favor among students of the Nuzi texts; cf. H. Lewy, "The Nuzian Feudal System," *Orientalia,* 1942, 11, 1-40.

[15] For example, cf. Gadd, *op. cit.,* tablet no. 9, p. 94.

Semitic; they lead a settled life, implemented with the institutions of an advanced civilization, and that too, in a state which, according to our present knowledge, emerges as definitely semi-feudal in character, at least. These characteristics, in addition to their polytheistic tendencies and ancestor worship, would seem to put them in a class quite apart from the patriarchs as portrayed for us in the Bible. Nevertheless, despite such evident contrasts and quite apart, on the other hand, from the fact that the Hurrians did speak Accadian, a language that must have been much closer to the tongue of the patriarchs than to biblical Hebrew, the language of their descendants,[16] we shall find that in both legal practice and social custom there is much that directs our gaze to an earlier common background.

THE PATRIARCHAL AGE

In the biblical narrative, the patriarchs appear as semi-nomads, tending their flocks in the hill country of Palestine, which archaeology shows to have been but sparsely settled in the Middle Bronze Age (2000-1600 B.C.) and following what may well have been seasonal migrations north and south. The well-known recital in Genesis offers abundant material for the consideration of problems of religious belief, cultic practice, history, chronology, etc. in this age, but only those aspects of it will be now briefly discussed which are of interest here. The historicity of the narrative as a whole no serious scholar will attempt to deny, so great has been its confirmation by archaeology in geographical[17] detail and customary usage. The form of society was in the main patriarchal, one, that is, wherein the families of many kinsmen were held together under the jurisdiction of the head of the clan. The intimate relationship between the patriarchs and Mesopotamia[18] stands out only too clearly: Jacob was called a wandering Aramaean (Deut. 26:5); the place-names Terah, Nahor, Serug in the region of Harran point significantly to the forebears of Abraham; both Isaac (Gen. 25:20) and Jacob (Gen. 28:2) take wives from the Harran country, and the genealogical lists (Gen. 10:22-23; 22:20-23) constantly stress

[16] W. F. Albright, "The names Shaddai and Abram," JBL, vol. 54, 1935, p. 179. The new Ras Shamra literature is a clear witness of how closely related East-Semitic and West-Semitic were between 3000 and 1700 B.C.

[17] W. F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, p. 132 ff.

[18] W. F. Albright, FSAC, p. 178 ff.

such racial and geographical ties. And most striking indeed in this same connection are the following words of W. F. Albright:

> The earlier cosmogonic and ethnogonic material of the first eleven chapters of Genesis is mostly inexplicable unless we suppose that it was brought from Mesopotamia to Palestine before the middle of the second millennium..... It has been shown recently in detail that the situation can be explained satisfactorily throughout if we suppose that the story of creation in Gen. 2, the story of Eden, the accounts of the antediluvian patriarchs, the Flood-story, and the story of the Tower of Babel were all brought from northwestern Mesopotamia to the West by the Hebrews before the middle of the second millennium.[19]

Neither our earlier knowledge of the Canaanite world nor the more recent mythological poetry of Ras Shamra can offer us similar material nor again does Egyptian literature present parallels here. That Mesopotamia, then, should be indicated so strongly as a source of patriarchal life and custom is a fair gauge of what a closer examination will yield. Often it will be possible only to draw the parallel and nothing more, at other times one may venture on to suggest what may have been the historical origin of this or that feature of common usage.

PATRIARCHAL SOCIETY

I. Offspring. In Gen. 16:2 Sarai says to her husband Abraham: "Behold, the Lord hath restrained me from bearing: go in unto my handmaid, it may be I may have children of her at least." This case, together with those of Jacob in regard to both Rachel and Lia (Gen. 30:3,9), offers three instances where a barren wife provides her husband with a handmaid in order to assure offspring of their marriage. Among the Nuzi tablets, a marriage contract gives us the juridical background for just such a procedure: "If Gilimninu bears no child, Gilimninu will take a woman of the country of N/Lullu as wife of Shennima and Gilimninu shall not have the right to drive out the offspring."[20] Small wonder too if a divine dispensation was needed to permit Ismael, the son of Agar, Sara's handmaid, to be driven out from his home! (Gen. 21:10-12). In the light of the extreme desire, so prominent in the ancient near East, to conserve the family

[19] W. F. Albright, FSAC, pp. 180, 181.

[20] HSS I 67 (Chiera, 1929); cf. C. H. Gordon, "Parallèles nouziens aux lois et aux coutumes de l'ancien Testament," RB, 1935, t. 44, p. 35 ff. The case under discussion also finds a striking parallel in the Code of Hammurabi, §146; cp. also §14 of the Sumerian laws.

throughout long generations, it is interesting to consider the *errêbu*[21] type of marriage in ancient Babylonia whereby, when a son was lacking, the family continued by having a daughter take a husband into the house of her father, who still retained authority over all the household. At Nuzi a similar institution seems to have prevailed. We read:

> Tablet of adoption whereby Našwa, son of Aršenni, has adopted Wullu, son of Buhišenni. So long as Našwa is alive, Wullu will give equally with Wullu, and the gods of Našwa, the sons of Našwa shall take. But if there be no son of Našwa then Wullu shall take also the gods of Našwa. Also he has given his daughter Nuhuia to Wullu to wife; if Wullu shall take another wife he shall vacate the lands and houses of Našwa.....[22]

Upon reading this document one thinks of the striking parallel it offers to the case of Jacob (Gen. 29–31) who, having labored for the hands of Rachel and Lia, lived in the house of Laban, his father-in-law and when fleeing unwittingly secured possession of the *teraphim*, which would seem to indicate him as Laban's heir. Striking too is Laban's concern and injunction that Jacob do not take other wives over his daughters (Gen. 31:50). The fact, however, that in Gen. 31:1 we read of the "sons of Laban" may be explained perhaps by their having been born years after Jacob had come into his home. Again in a Nuzi tablet published by Lacheman (N 661) we read of a certain Šamaš-qarrad who becomes Tehiptilla's slave on the condition that the latter provide a wife for him. This reminds us obviously of Jacob's having to work for his brides (Gen. 29:18,30), although, of course, Jacob was not a slave.

At this juncture it is not irrelevant to point out that the institution of levirate marriage, which in itself deserves special treatment, is in the Old Testament, both in legislation (Deut. 25:5-10) and in the sample case of Thamar[23] (Gen. 38:8) attributed to the

[21] M. Burrows, "The Complaint of Laban's Daughters," JAOS, 1937, Vol. 55, p. 261 ff.

[22] C. J. Gadd, *op. cit.*, no. 51, pp. 126.

[23] Julius Lewy (*op. cit.*, p. 30 ff) thought he could find in §33 of the Assyrian law code (15-14 cent. B.C.) a proviso which demanded that the father-in-law himself should espouse his son's widow in default of another son. Thus Juda's relations with Thamar were not incestuous but quite the expected thing. Yet as Paul Koschaker has pointed out in "Fratriarchat, Hausgemeinschaft und Mutterrecht in Keilschriftrechten," ZA, 1933, Bd. 7, S. 85 (new series), the Assyrian law deals not with the levirate marriage

desire that the name of the deceased brother "be not abolished out of Israel." Gordon,[24] following Westermarck and Koschaker, submits that such was not its original nature but that the institution was a vestige of fratriarchy[25] wherein the wife, as her husband's property, was upon the latter's death *ipso facto* inherited by his brother and cites a text from Nuzi[26] which reveals the stipulation made by a father buying a bride for his son, that she is to become the bride of another son of his, if the former dies. The intrusion therefore of such a motive as that indicated in Deuteronomy would be relatively late and is due, according to Koschaker,[27] to the emergence of the *Kleinfamilie* and the need felt to maintain it, as opposed to that larger social unit, the patriarchal clan. Yet Millar Burrows[28] would see very primitive origins in this institution as portrayed in the Bible since it would mean as much to the clan to have one of its members pass on childless, his name dying out, as to have him suffer death at the hands of another, and if the nearest kinsman could avenge the latter, why could he not also, by marrying the widow, remedy the former? At any rate, the remarkable parallel evidence found both in Nuzi and in Genesis for the desire, by no means late in

---

but rather with the power of the widow's father to marry her off again, albeit to her father-in-law.

[24] C. H. Gordon, "Fratriarchy in the Old Testament," JBL, 1935, p. 230.

[25] A lengthy treatment of fratriarchy is beyond the scope of this paper. Paul Koschaker in a splendid article (cf. note 23) claims from a study of Hittite (1395-1355 B.C.) Arrapha (1450 B.C.) and Elamite (1600 B.C.) sources that the fratriarchal type of society is more ancient than the patriarchal as we know it. The fratriarchate became dissolved through individualistic concern for each one's own posterity, leading to the co-equal rights of brothers in a family in place of the unique and exclusive right of the oldest son over all his brothers. Thus the patriarchal institution prevailed, leading to patriarchal family groups, rather than large units, fratriarchal in character. It is not a question, of course, of asking which came first, the chick or the egg,—in most primitive times, a patriarchal group was the natural social unit. Whatever be the merits of such an analysis, Gordon (cf. note 24) has collected interesting traces of fratriarchy in the Old Testament for patriarchal times and later.

[26] C. H. Gordon, "Biblical Customs and the Nuzi Tablets," BA, 1940, vol. III, no. 1, p. 10.

[27] "Die Eheformen bei den Indogermanen," *Deutsche Landesreferate zum II Internationalen Kongress für Rechtsvergleichung in Haag*, 1937, pp. 101-3, 113 ff.

[28] M. Burrows, "Levirate Marriage in Israel," JBL, 1940, Vol. 59, p. 32.

history, to assure one a blessed posterity can quite favorably be appealed to in such an explanation as well as in understanding the text cited by Gordon. Just such evidence is at hand in the case of a barren wife giving her husband a handmaid as well as in the *errêbu* type of marriage, the two instances just discussed.

II. Inheritance. In a patriarchal form of society, the first-born son was the natural titulary of many rights and privileges. He received his father's special blessing (Gen. 27:19,27), and was the obvious heir to the property and role of his father in the clan. At times, however, so great was the *patria potestas* that the first-born, as in the case of Ruben, could be subjected to a younger brother (Gen. 49:8). We are reminded here too of the text in 1 Par. 26:10 ". . . . Semri, the chief, for he was not the first-born, but his father made him chief."[29] Regarding the inheritance of property the incident narrated in Gen. 25:31-34 of Esau selling his birthright to his brother Jacob for bread and a pottage of lentils is well known. From Nuzi the tablet N 204 *ana ahhûti*: for brotherhood, tells of Kurpazah, who for three sheep, receives an orchard as his inheritance share from his brother Tupkitilla.

Apart from the obvious rights of the first-born, one is curious to know the status in regard to inheritance of a son not born of the first wife. For Nuzi, Hildegard Lewy[30] has discussed the interesting case of a certain Šelluni who is made adoptive son of Akapšenni and of the latter's main wife, Telkušhe, whence she concluded that Šelluni was quite presumably the son of an *esirtu* or concubine, and as such, incapable of inheriting directly from his father,—hence the need of adoption.[31] A text she has not dis-

[29] 1 Par. 26:10, if the reading given is correct. The Hebrew text is obscure.

[30] H. Lewy, "The ahhûtu Documents from Nuzi," *Orientalia*, 1940, Vol. IX, p. 362 ff.

[31] In the light of this interpretation too, Mrs. Lewy would view the status of Kurpazah, whose case was just cited above. Thus he, too, would have been the son of an *esirtu* and by being adopted as brother by Tuptikilla in N 204, and again by another brother Punniia in N 87, a second text discussed by Mrs. Lewy, he becomes capable of inheriting. Gordon (cf. note 26) has understood the case as a sale-adoption, but since the contracting parties were already blood brothers before the adoption, it is hard to see how such a sale-adoption was necessary in the Nuzian feudal state for the transmission of property. Mrs. Lewy's view may be the more correct one, namely, they were only half-brothers and it was a case of securing full

cussed and which would make her point much more clearly is that of a certain Heršitta who takes to wife Teššennai . . . "then all his lands, and houses and everything that belongs to Heršitta (belongs) also to his sons by Teššennai. The sons by a second wife of Heršitta, shall not be made joint (heirs) in the lands, houses, and everything belonging to Heršitta."[32] In the Assyrian laws (§ 41) we are told that sons of concubines may inherit if the first wife is childless, but more apposite still in the present connection is the case of Jephte, who is cast out by his brothers with the words: "Thou canst not inherit in the house of our father, because thou art born of another mother" (Jdgs. 11:2).

In the case of the *errêbu* type of adoption, already referred to in regard to Jacob's service of Laban (cf. *supra*), it is important to note that the adoptive son inherited his new parent's property. Quite different, however, is the instance met with in Gen. 15:2 ff. where Eliezer, not the *errêbu* son, but the servant of Abraham, is called his heir also, until in v. 4 we read, "He shall not be thy heir, but he that shall come out of thy bowels, him shalt thou have for thy heir." In other words, a slave, even though entitled to inheritance, must yield place to a natural son, if subsequently born. Gordon[33] has cited two apt texts from Nuzi to illustrate this point: H IX 22, where an adopted slave is made heir in exchange for attending his adoptor in lifetime and burying him in death; and H V 7, 60,67, where the adopted son must give up his place as chief heir to the adoptor's own son, born after the adoption.

In Num. 27:3,6 we read the singular instance of the daughters of Salphaad who, being fatherless and brotherless, demand an inheritance among their kinsmen, a petition which is granted them by divine legislation, although it is prescribed (Num. 36) that they marry within their own tribe, lest their inheritance pass on to another. At Nuzi, in a text[34] we have already cited in part,

---

rights of inheritance for the son of the secondary wife. Yet Mrs. Lewy seems to overshoot the mark when she goes on to say that the *aḫḫûtu* documents are like those mentioned in regard to the *ilku* clause (cf. note 14), i.e., means employed by the crown to secure the land upon the death of the tenant. In general, one walks on safer ground when parsimonious in interpretation.

[32] C. J. Gadd, *op. cit.*, no. 12, p. 97, ll. 15-26.

[33] BA, *op. cit.*, p. 2.

[34] C. H. Gordon, RB, *op. cit.*, p. 38, (HSS V 67, 1, 27 ff.)

Gilimninu, "if she does not bear a son, the daughter of Gilim (ninu) should take one part of the property." Certainly, in either case, such a concession could aptly serve as a dowry, and in this sense, it will be pertinent enough here to discuss the claim implied in the words of Laban's daughters, Rachel and Lia, when about to flee with Jacob,—"Hath he (Laban) not counted us as strangers, and sold us, and eaten the price of us?" (Gen. 31:14). In the light of a number of Nuzi tablets,[35] wherein it is shown that the person who receives the *kaspu,* i.e., the money or price, is entitled to "eat" (*akâlu*) it, it has been suggested that Laban, an Aramaean, in doing just this very thing, was thus treating his daughters, as strangers, to wit, as Nuzians. In other words, here is one instance where, in so doing wrong, Laban shows that biblical usage was similar but rather directly opposed to Nuzian practice. Yet Millar Burrows,[36] following Speiser, would sooner see a similarity of custom between the Aramaeans and Nuzians in this respect and at the same time still show that the daughters offered a just complaint, since certain other Nuzi texts[37] manifest a tendency already afoot whereby the right of the father or guardian to full consumption of the bridal price was in the process of becoming a trust fund for the daughter, e.g., in case of divorce or widowhood. That the same should have been the case, and even in a more advanced stage too, among the Aramaeans is easily credible.

Thus the resemblance between biblical and Nuzian practices of inheritance in regard to illegitimate sons, the rights of the *errêbu* and adopted son, of the slave and finally of daughters appears so striking that to infer from it a social milieu, fairly common to both as the original source of such usage is in no wise rash and is strongly confirmatory of the evidence given in Genesis as to the local and cultural provenience of the patriarchs.

III. Community Responsibility. It was by no means foreign to the mentality of the ancient Near East to attach guilt to a whole community when any single offender could not be detected and even at times when he could. As an example of the latter it is enough to peruse the thirty-fourth chapter of Genesis which

[35] Cf. Gadd, *op. cit.,* no. 35, l. 23 ff.; AASOR X, no. 31, l. 14 ff. and 27 ff.; Contenau, *Textes Cunéiformes* IX, no. 7, ll. 9-12.

[36] JAOS, 1937, *op. cit.,* p. 271.

[37] Cf. AASOR X, pp. 22-4.

tells how all the men of Sichem were slain, their children and wives taken captive, their flocks led off and their city plundered for the ravishing of Dina by Hemor. In the time of the Judges, all but six hundred of the Benjamites were slain for the outrage committed against the wife of a Levite who was sojourning in Gabaa (Jdgs. 19–21). In Deut. 21:1-7 it is prescribed that, if anyone be found slain lying in the field and his murderer unknown, then the elders of the nearest city are to break a heifer's neck in the valley and to wash their hands over it, saying: "Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it" (v. 7). In some tablets from Nuzi, less momentous issues are treated, to be sure, but the resemblance to the foregoing is nevertheless striking. In N. 125[38] a certain Gelteshup accuses the townsmen of Purulli of burglary and larceny, but "so declare the men of Purulli: We swear that they did not steal these things which (are listed) according to (this) tablet, from the house of Gelteshup and that the men of Purulli did not *break into* the house of Gelteshup" (l. 12-17). In N. 135 and 184 we have reports of investigations concerning given districts and, as Gordon suggests, possibly because of crime. In N. 337 we read of the town of Hurašina, which is held accountable for the death of an ass. Surely, if such care were exercised in Nuzi regarding matters of such a nature, a fortiori even greater concern was had there when it was a question of a man's loss of honor, life or limb.

CONCLUSION

Divine truths and the word of God have their own permanent and immutable values and, as such, are independent of place and time. Yet man comes to the knowledge of these truths only as they are given to him, that is, most usually in a setting of place and time. To know that setting is of utmost importance. The preceding pages have tried to suggest how much archaeology can contribute and has contributed to the securing, the broadening, and the deepening of that knowledge by pointing out how it has made more informed and secure our control of the second millennium B.C. in the ancient Near East. And, more in particular, these pages have tried to indicate how archaeology bears witness

[38] C. H. Gordon, "An Akkadian Parallel to Deut. 21," RA, 1936, pp. 1-6 from Chiera, *Declarations in Court, Publications of the Baghdad School* II, (Paris; 1930).

to the truth of the tradition in Genesis regarding the close geographical and social bonds between Israel and Mesopotamia, illustrating these with truly impressive parallels from Nuzi which touch upon the desire for offspring, rights of inheritance and community responsibility. The Nuzi texts are only a few of the many thousands of texts of the ancient Orient that hold a message for us and only a few of the Nuzi texts spoke here. They can teach us more and more.

Johns Hopkins University
Baltimore, Maryland

THE RIDER ON THE WHITE HORSE

Apocalypse 6:1-8

Rev. J. S. Considine, O.P.

The scene of Apocalypse 6:1-8, depicting the four horsemen, is one of the most popular in the book. The horsemen spring up before the throne of God, one by one at the command of the cherubim, while the Lamb opens the seals, and there comes before the seer's eye a vision of the awe-inspiring panorama of the future as seal after seal is broken. The vision in its broad outlines is readily grasped by the imagination and easily transferred to canvas. It has, in fact, inspired many illustrious artists and, among them, Dürer. And the reason is that John sees and describes only the bold outlines of the scene before him; the warriors who ride over the ravaged world—War, Famine, Disease, Death—are pictured, without bewildering complexity and perplexing detail. The scene is easier to represent than many other visions in the same book, which often defy the brush of an artist and almost escape the analytical power of a writer's pen. What, for instance, did John see through that open door of chap. 4? We cannot visualize many of the details that John describes; they are intellectually but not pictorially comprehensible. Many of the details appear fantastic and even grotesque, and it would seem that the ecstatic experience of the Seer enjoyed the same liberty which the human imagination possesses in dreams.[1] For instance, it is clear that the living creatures of chap. 4 are meant to convey, among other things, the idea of vitality and vigilance, and yet it is impossible to picture a creature with a face like a man and yet with eyes all over. Or again, how did the Lamb grasp the seven sealed scroll? Or how did the Lamb open the seals which no other was worthy to open? We can understand the metaphor but we cannot visualize it. Of course it is understandable that earthly symbols cannot always be found to supply the details of a prophet's vision, for when an attempt is made to describe God, heaven, and the future life, the symbols taken from earthly things are always inadequate. It is not surprising, then, that, when John describes in vision secrets that pertain to the last things and to the future life, his symbols should be released

[1] B. Allo, "Le Premier Cavalier Du Chapitre VI," *Revue Biblique* (1914) p. 1.

from conformity to earthly patterns. Of course, this does not add to our understanding of the mystery, but the mystery is not so much in the symbol as in what the symbol signifies. But there is little mystery in the symbols of the four horsemen; they create a vivid and terrifying picture which is at once understandable to the mind and satisfying to the eye.

The scene is dramatic but is it new? Is there anything very new or startling in the disclosures symbolized by the horsemen? The horsemen announce the tribulations of war, famine, and disease before the final consummation of all things in God. But is it not the burden of the message of every prophet of the Old Testament that grievous punishment would be the lot of evil-doers? Did not Christ in the New Testament foretell that the same trio of woes—war, famine, disease—would fall on an evil world and especially on that race out of which the Messias came? Are not lamentations, dirges, and woes traditionally associated in Jewish eschatology? Did not Babylonian folk-lore make use of many of the same symbols which the Seer employs? It is quite true that the four cavaliers of conquest, war, famine, and disease have ridden tempestuously through many a prophetic book and through books which are not prophetic, though not always grouped in the same way that John has grouped them. The images of John's vision of the horsemen, in great part, existed before he had the vision and were present to his memory when he wrote the vision down.[2] And yet there is something new in the vision of John.

It is a new revelation. To understand this we must recall that chap. 6 belongs to the second part of the Apocalypse announced in 1:19 concerning "the things that are to come hereafter." This second part comprises the greater part of the book and is divided into two main sections, 6–11, and 12:1–21:8. Chapters 6–9 contain visions of "the things that are to come hereafter" as viewed from the side of the profane world and chapters 12–21 portray the conflict as viewed from the side of the Church. The whole of this section is preceded by an interposed or preparatory vision, which is found in chapters 4 and 5. The vision of the seals begins in chapter 4 and extends to the first verse of chapter 8. By the interposed vision of chapters 4 and 5 our attention is drawn from the world below and the seven struggling churches, and

[2] B. Allo, *op. cit.* p. 7.

focused on the world above and upon the Eternal who is ruling over all. With chapter 4 there is an entire change of scene and subject: hitherto the scene of John's vision was earth; now it is heaven. And the vision is that in all her vicissitudes and struggles the Church need not fear; God is her refuge and from His throne in heaven watches over her. Here there are no more fears nor alarms nor any more wrong doing. An infinite harmony prevails, and all the angelic orders proclaim before the throne of God the holiness of God, to whose will the whole world submits. The vision of chapter 4 is interposed to bring before our minds the consoling idea that all the decrees of God respecting the future rest with God. The vision is a vision of the Master of human destiny and His court.

In chapter 5 the vision of chapter 4 remains. The scene does not change, but the attention of the Seer is now directed to the book or scroll in the hand of the one who sits upon the throne. And no one, in heaven or on earth or under the earth could open the book except the Lamb, who by his victory has shown Himself equal to the task of looking upon the book and of opening it. By His redeeming death the Lamb is found worthy to open the book. Thereupon, the whole court of heaven and the whole world of creatures, in heaven, on earth, and under the earth join in a new song of praise and thanksgiving to Him that sits upon the throne and to the Lamb. As in chapter 4 we have a vision of the Throned One, to whom the whole world submits, so in chapter 5 we have a vision of the Lamb to whom the destinies of the world are committed, and, as chapter 4 centers around God the Creator so chapter 5 centers around God the Redeemer, who executes the decrees of God. This heavenly court does not fade away in the chapters that follow but dominates all the visions to the end of the book.

The execution of the decrees of God begins in chapter 6 with a vision of the opening of the seals. The visions of the seals are visions of things which have not taken place but will take place at the time of the sounding of the trumpets; the seven seals are but preludes to the seven trumpets. They are, therefore, preparatory visions and reveal, in a summary manner, the divine plan. War, famine, disease, and death are natural plagues and a disciple of Christ knows before any revelation that God will make use of these visible and natural means to chastise a rebellious

world. But when, and how, or under what circumstances these will be used is not known and will not be known until the Angels sound the trumpets, when the preparations or plans, already made in heaven, will become actual on earth. When, therefore, John beholds the plagues, personified by the horsemen, he beholds the preparations of heaven to chastise the world at a time and manner already decreed by God.

The symbols of these visions and the visions that follow were not invented by John; he found a number of them in the Old Testament; some of them are in the Apocrypha and some may reach back to Babylonian astronomy.[3] But it is not any too certain that John used sources outside the Old and the New Testaments. There are many allusions to popular apocalyptic traditions in the Apocalypse but there are no direct quotations. We know that apocalyptic thought and writing were common in the early Church, or, at least prevalent at that time, from the many apocalyptic writings which have been brought to light in recent years, but the uncertaintly of the date of many of these writings makes it just as plausible to say that they depend on John as that John depends on them.[4] The allusions to Babylonian mythology or folklore, especially in the episode of the horesmen, are tenuous and are pointed out with certainty only by Pan-Babylonian writers. As far as the vision of the horsemen is concerned, we need not look outside the Old and New Testaments; that John was steeped in Old Testament literature and familiar with the apocalyptic discourses of Christ is easily seen by even a cursory reading of all three. If we put the Synoptics and the Apocalypse side by side, it is evident that they practically present the same material.

Matt. 6:6-7	Mark 13:7-9	Luke 21:8-11	Apoc. 6:1-8
1. Wars.	1. Wars.	1. War.	1. Conquest.
2. Strife	2. Strife.	2. Strife.	2. Strife.
3. Pestilence.	3. Earthquakes.	3. Earthquakes	3. Famine.
4. Famines.	4. Famines.	4 Pestilence.	4. Pestilence.
		5. Famines.	(Death, Hades)

[3] B. Allo, L'Apocalypse, (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1821). Cf. also E. Jacquier, *Histoire Des Livres Du Noveau Testament*, (Paris: J. Gabalda, 1908). p. 360 R.H. Charles, *The Revelation of Saint John* (New York: Scribner's 1925) Vol. I, p. LXXXXI.

[4] Martin Kiddle, *The Revelation of Saint John* (New York: Harper, 1941) p. xxii.

In the Synoptics and in the Apocalypse other signs of the End are given—indeed, the seven seals embrace the seven woes of Luke by combining two woes, earthquakes and signs in the heavens, under the sixth seal—but we are concerned here only with the woes personified by the horsemen. It is not surprising, of course, that John should be familiar with the apocalyptic discourses of Christ; he was the favorite disciple of Christ. Nor should it be surprising that the prophecies in the Apocalypse present the same matter as the prophecies in the Synoptics; the prophecies of the Prophet of Galilee are no different in substance from the prophecies of the Lamb, for both are prophecies of the same divine Person, Christ. And John tells us in the opening sentence of his book that the revelation contained therein is the revelation of Jesus Christ. But the form in the Apocalypse is different. This is due, no doubt, to the literary method of John. When he wrote down his vision, certain Old Testament memories were present to his mind consciously—or even unconsciously rather than consciously, for he does not seem to make any conscious literary references—and so his vision took a tinge of Old Testament coloring. These memories go back to the Pentateuch and to the covenant made by God with mankind; the rainbow of chapter 4 brings this to our mind. God made a covenant of mercy with mankind but pronounced terrible woes on those who would break it. In Lev. 26, the woes are enumerated: consumption, fever, famine, defeat by the enemy, and slavery. If these woes do not bring about a reformation, then God will punish the violators of his laws seven times for their sins. In all, three series of seven plagues are promised to fall on evil doers, culminating in punishments so terrible that the very sound of a flying leaf will bring terror to men's minds. Perhaps this grouping of woes in a series of seven lies in the background of the various groups of seven punishments in the Apocalypse, which portray the future lot of a sinful people. And other memories of the great prophecies of the past thronged in his mind. But the specific source for the form of the woes personified by the horsemen is to be found in Zacharias. The mysterious and colorful symbols of Zacharias 1:8 and 6:1-8, no doubt, exercised a strong influence over John. Zacharias saw a vision of four horses and four chariots. And the horses were colored red, black, speckled, and white. John interpreted the four horses of the first vision

and the four chariots of the second vision of the wrath directed by God on the world and used them as symbols.

Much of John, then, especially in the vision of the horsemen, is not new. He did not create the framework of his picture but is the picture within the frame new? Was John merely an editor of Old or New Testament sources? Did he simply bring them into alignment with the sevenfold plan of his book? Is the Apocalypse nothing more than an awkward grafting of sources, as some have argued? Did he not adapt the great prophecies of the Old Testament to his own point of view? To think that he simply compiled his book from pre-existing sources or that he adapted the great prophecies of the Old Testament to fit a preconceived plan is to miss the whole point of his book. The picture that John paints is new, even if some of the colors in the painting be old. And the new message in John's painting concerns the fate of the Church when these woes fall upon the world. The Church might fear during persecution and tribulation and wonder if faith would endure because of the cryptic saying of our Lord in Luke 18:8: "Yet when the Son of Man comes, will he find, do you think, faith on earth?" The answer of John is distinct and clear: "The Lamb has overcome the world, so be of good cheer." It is not on the red horse nor on the black horse nor on the pale-green horse that our eyes must be focused, for these horses with their riders have often ridden together, and the main purpose of their ride is destruction, but our eyes must rather rest on the white horse and its rider, who goes forth conquering and to conquer, and also on chapter 7, which is commonly called an interlude in the series of the seals, but it is much more important than that, for it gives the meaning of the vision as a whole. Chapter 7 belongs to the sixth seal; it is the second part of the tableau and pictures the security and peace of the friends of the Lamb during the awful visional panic caused by the fearful riding of the horsemen. This is the secret of the scroll: perseverance in holding to Christ and His Church will surely bring the peace and joy of Christ to the soul.

The vision of the four horsemen has not the same importance as some other visions in the Apocalypse, as, for example, the vision of the Woman and the Dragon of chapter 12, or of the Beasts of chapter 13. Nevertheless, it manifests the special character of John's revelation and marks off his revelation from other

apocalyptic writings, whether these other writings are inspired or not inspired. And the distinct character of John's revelation in the episode of the horsemen is found in the rider on the white horse. By this rider this episode of the horsemen fits into the general plan of John's revelation, namely, that Christ executes the decres of God. We shall first give the text and then a brief analysis of it.

1. And I saw when the Lamb opened one of the seven seals,
   and I heard one of the four living creatures calling as with
   a voice of thunder, 'Come.'
2. And I looked, and behold a white horse,
   And he that sat thereon had a bow,
   And there was given him a crown,
   And he went forth conquering and to conquer.
3. And when he opened the second seal I heard the second liv-
   ing creature calling, 'Come.'
4. And another horse, a red one, went forth,
   And to him that sat thereon it was given
   to take peace from off the earth,
   And that they should slay one another,
   And there was given to him a great sword.
5. And when he opened the third seal, I heard the third
   living creature calling, 'Come.'
   And I looked, and behold, a black horse,
   And he that sat thereon had a pair of scales
   in his hand.
6. And I heard as it were a voice in the midst of the four living
   creatures, calling,
   A shilling for a quart of wheat,
   And a shilling for three quarters of barley,
   But do no hurt to the oil and the wine.
7. And when he opened the fourth seal, I heard the voice of the
   fourth living creature, calling, 'Come.'
8. And I looked, and behold a pallid horse,
   And he that sat thereon was named Death and Hades
   followed him,
   And power was given them over a fourth part of the earth
   To kill with sword and with famine and with death,
   And with the wild beasts of the earth.

The text underlying this translation is, in the main, the text of Westcott and Hort. The Vulgate text, which is compared with this text, is the text of the Clementine Edition in conjunction with the edition of Wordsworth and White. The Vulgate text does not differ notably except in one instance. From the text it is clear that each one of the riders is characterized, with the exception of Hades, by his horse, or by his name, or by an attribute sufficiently explicit: Conquest or War, War, Famine, Pestilence. Death carries no symbol to distinguish him; he is known by the corpse-like color of his horse, and his companion is Hades. It is not clear whether the two ride on one horse or whether Hades follows on foot. The text states simply, *ἠκολούθει*, which is not very helpful. At any rate we have two persons and only one horse. There is a certain likeness among the riders—all four have to deal with judgments. But the rider on the first horse is not in the same category with the other three, as stands out from an analysis of the text.

1,2 "I saw," *καὶ εἶδον* this formula is characteristic of apocalyptic literature and connotes an ecstatic condition.[5] "When," *ὅτε*, and not *ὅτι*, which is the reading of several Mss. The Vulgate has "quod." "One of," *μίαν ἐκ* as a cardinal, and not *πρώτην* "the first of." It is possible that we may have a Hebraism here for אחד מן. It is, also, possible that *εἷς* came in Byzantine Greek to be used as an ordinal and that we have an instance here.[6] The use of the ordinal in 3, 5, 7, supports this. But from the nature of the scroll it is more natural to take the phrase as "one of."—"With a voice of thunder," or "by a voice of thunder," *θωνῇ*, in the dative. Westcott and Hort and the Vulgate have the word in the accusative; others take it as a nominative. Nearly all textual evidence is against reading it as a dative, which we must read to get an intelligible text.—"Come," *ἔρχου*, is addressed, not to John, but to the horsemen. Some think that it is addressed to Christ, but Christ, as the Lamb, is opening the scroll. Who answer the call? There is but one answer—the horsemen. Those that think it is addressed to John read *καὶ ἴδε* after *ἔρχου*. The Vulgate has the reading, "veni et vide."—"Conquering and to conquer," *νικῶν καὶ ἵνα νικήσῃ*, the construction means that he con-

[5] R. H. Charles, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 106.

[6] J. H. Moulton, *Greek Grammar* and A. T. Robertson, *Greek Grammar of the New Testament* (London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1919).

quers and continues to conquer.[7] The same construction is found in John 10:38, ἵνα γνῶτε καὶ γινώσκητε, "in order that you may recognize and go on recognizing."

The Lamb begins to open the seals and he begins by any one seal, for the scroll is an opisthograph, that is a roll having writing on the back as well as the front and sealed along the border of the roll, when it is rolled up, by seven seals each seal helping to keep it closed. The number seven is symbolic, indicating that the contents of the book are completely and divinely withdrawn from the observations of creatures.[8] The visions are not read out from the book, for the book cannot be opened until the seventh seal is broken, but "the contents are forthwith translated into action in the visions of the Seer."[9] The living creatures preside over nature which awaits with eager longing "the revelation of the sons of God" (Rom. 8:19), and so they summon the precursors of the final coming of the Messias for which the whole of creation longs.[10]

The form of the vision is based on the four sets of horses and chariots of Zacharias, as we have already seen, but the functions and the character of the figures are changed. John was free to arrange the colors in any order that fitted his purpose for they are cited three times in Zacharias, and the order is different in each citation, but John does not follow any of the three of Zacharias, for John puts the white horse first. Some take this white horse as a mere emblem of victory or conquest, as the second rider represents war; the third, famine; and the fourth, death. There is thus a harmony of interpretation: the four horsemen reveal what the world may expect before the Coming, war, famine, and death. This is no more than Jewish apocalyptic thought, and there is something more in the vision of John, something specifically Christian. The symbolism—"the white horse," "the bow," "the crown"—demands more than this. The first horseman is something more than an ordinary woe announcing the End. Moreover, this horseman does not remain in heaven at the call of the cherubim, but goes forth, ἐξῆλθεν, conquering and to conquer. The second horseman does not go forth as we shall see.

[7] A. T. Robertson, *op. cit.*, p. 850.
[8] B. Allo, *L'Apocalypse* p. 69.
[9] R. H. Charles, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 106.
[10] H. B. Swete, *Apocalypse of Saint John.*
[11] R. H. Charles, vol. I, p. cxxxii. Cf. B. Allo, *L'Apocalypse*, p. cxli.

3, 4. "Come," ἔρχου καὶ ἴδε, repeated by several Mss. The Vulgate adds "et vide."—"That sat thereon," ἐπ'αὐτὸν; here we have the accusative against the rule of ἐπί in the Apocalypse. "From off the earth," ἐκ τῆς γῆς, ἐκ is omitted by A, but the sense is about the same. "A sword," μάχαιρα, is a short sword but here it is a synonym for ῥομφαία, of verse 8, a great sword, i.e., a long Thracian javelin.

There is no doubt about the signification of this horse: it signifies war, civil and international strife, although some, as Andrew, have confined it to the persecutions of the Christians. "Nation will rise against nation," as the Sypnotics state it. The second horseman does not ride forth after the manner of the first horseman, but stands before the throne of God awaiting the divine order. The same word, ἐξῆλθεν, is used, as of the first horseman, but here it means that the horseman arose from the sea of glass or from in front of the throne. He does not receive the sword until his role is assigned to him, which indicates that he has not, as yet, entered into action; a soldier receives his weapon, not after, but before the battle. The "bow" is characteristic of the first rider but the "sword" is not characteristic of this rider; it is given to him while the first rider has the "bow." The sword belongs to eschatological tradition. It is mentioned in this sense in Isa. 27:1 34:5 etc.; in Ez. 21:3, where it is wielded by God himself. It is, also, found in Jewish apocalyptic writing; the very words—ἐδόθη μάχαιρα μεγάλη are found in Enoch xc, 19. The peace mentioned is a wrong peace. Christ came to bring true peace. The words of John, λαβεῖν τὴν εἰρήνην etc., seem to be a reminiscence of the words of our Lord of Matt. 10:34.

5, 6. "Come," ἔρχου. καὶ ἴδε is added by several Mss as above. "Et vide" is added by the Vulgate. A pair of scales, ζυγὸν is the beam of the balance from which a pair of scales is suspended. In Ezechiel bread is sold by weight as a token of scarcity (6;16). —There is a peculiar use of ὡς here as is noted by Charles and Allo.[12]

When the third seal was opened a black horse came forth. Black indicates mourning and the mourning is caused by famine. The voice calls out the coming price of wheat and barley and the price is a famine price. The choenix is equal to about two pints, which was the amount of food sufficient to support a man for a

[12] Charles, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 166.

day. The denarius would amount to about a shilling in our money and this was the usual daily pay for a soldier. The whole of man's daily pay goes for food and this is a terribly high price for food. Outside of times of famine, the purchasing price of the denarius was 8, 10, or 12 times as great.[13] What is meant by "do not hurt to the oil and the wine"? Andrew[14] thinks that the admonition is for the purpose of conserving wine for the Mass. Such an interpretation might seem fantastic if we did not know of the shock Josephus received when he heard of the desecration of the wine used in the temple sacrifices during the tenure of John of Gischala.[15] Others see an historical reference to a decree of Domitian restricting the cultivation of the vine. Some maintain that it is a warning against destroying the olive trees and the vines, because it takes years for olive trees and vines to mature; a new year may bring new wheat, but if the olive trees are destroyed, a new year will not bring new olives.[16] Charles[17] attempts to show that the admonition is a relic of apocolyptic beliefs, but his attempt is not very convincing. Swete thinks that it is a protestation on the part of the voice of this verse against the dearth of food, and thus a note of mercy is introduced into the plague. If the voice from the midst of the four living creatures is the voice of God or of the Lamb, then a note of mercy is introduced which becomes more distinct by the restriction of the second part of verse 8.

7, 8. "Come," *ἔρχου. καὶ ἴδε*, added by a number of Mss. The Vulgate has "et vide".—"And it was given to them," *καὶ ἐδόθη αὐτοῖς*; *αὐτῷ*, "to him," in the singular, is the reading of most of the Mss. but the sense demands the plural, and this is the reading of Aleph, A, C, and P. The Vulgate has the singular, "illi." Most critics agree that we should take it as a plural, but Charles[17] and others object to this, because they maintain that the text is corrupt and part of it is interpolated.—By means of wild beasts, *ὑπὸ τῶν θηρίων*, the construction of *ὑπό* after an active verb is extraordinary, and there is no other example in the New Testament. Because of this, perhaps, A has the reading: *τὸ τέταρτον τῶν θηρίων*, which changes the sense. For *τὸ τέταρτον τῆς γῆς* the Vulgate

[13] Charles, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 167.
[14] Andrew of Cesarea, MPG, 106.
[15] Flavius Josephus, *The Wars of the Jews.* Book 5, c. xiii, paragraph 6.
[16] Ramsey, *Cities of St. Paul* (London: 1904).
[17] Charles, *op. cit.*, p. 168.
[18] Charles, *op. cit.*, 169.

reads, "quatuor partes terrae," which is an entirely different sense.

After War and Famine comes Pestilence. Pestilence rides a pale-green, pale-yellow or livid horse. It is the color of a corpse in an advanced stage of decomposition or the color of the face which fear has decomposed. The wild beasts naturally follow in the wake of death as in Ez. 6:16-17. Hades follows the three plagues to swallow up the victims. Hades, or hell, as it is often translated, is not the hell of the damned; that is pictured in 20:14, where Death and Hades are cast into the lake of fire. There is a certain want of harmony introduced into this verse, as we have already noticed. We have two figures but only one horse. Are the two riding one horse? If they are, the construction should be οἱ καθήμενοι instead of ὁ καθήμενος He is not riding a separate horse, for the scene supposes only four horses. There is an assault on the symmetry of the scene, but it is a violent solution to maintain, as Charles and others do, that the verse is an interpolation. The reason for the assault on the symmetry we will notice later.

In the second part of verse 8 all the destructive power of the three plagues of War, Famine and Disease are given to Death and Hades, but the power of these two is restricted to "a fourth part of the earth." Here again a note of mercy is introduced and it emphasizes the note of mercy of verse 6: the plagues are partly admonitory and reformative, at least in intent. Thus while the first rider rides to his conquests, the instruments of divine justice stand before the throne of God, waiting the signal to fall upon those who resist the mercy of the Conqueror.

From this brief analysis it can be seen that the first rider is distinctly marked off from the other three riders in the vision of the woes which will fall on mankind before the End. Indeed, he has only two things in common with the other horsemen: he is a horseman and he answers the call of one of the cherubim. All commentators agree that there is something distinctive in the role of this first horseman, but, unlike the artists who have visualized the scene, they do not agree on the trait which makes the first rider distinctive. A great number of them attempt to preserve a harmony of interpretation in the roles of the horsemen and conceive the first rider as the first member in a series of four: the after history of the world is marked off by the four epochs of conquest, war, famine, and death. These epochs are

either successive or they are not. Those who hold to successive phases in the vision see in the first rider an image of the Roman conquests of the first century to the time of Domitian. Some, as Andrew, have spiritualized these epochs and see in the first rider a symbol of the triumphant preaching of the Gospel by the Apostles as the second rider symbolizes the age of the martyrs and doctors who followed the time of the Apostles, and the third portrays the period of spiritual weakness which followed the age of persecution, and the fourth pictures the time of persecution under Domitian. This, however, is pushing the text very far and the plagues of the others are not distinctive of epochs in human history; war, famine, disease and death are all too common in every period, for war begets famine, famine begets disease and disease causes death and all in one and the same historical epoch.

Others take the four horsemen as personifications of four plagues, and since the last three are sufficiently identified by the text, the first, by analogy, is one of them. He is, therefore, a plague, and because of his "bow" and his "conquests," must be identified with war in general or triumphant militarism—the warlike monarchies of the Romans or Parthians appeared as types of evils which would return before the triumphal Coming of the Messias. It is difficult, however, to see how this rider, in this interpretation, differs notably from the second rider, for then both would represent war.

Others seek to explain the first rider by seeing in him a reflection of an historical reality contemporaneous with the Apocalypse. According to Ramsay,[19] Swete[20] and others, the text points first and solely to the Parthian Empire; Volter[21] interprets the first rider of Volgasses, King of the Parthians, who defeated the Romans on the Tigris in 62; Spitta interprets the text of Rome. Although the habiliments of the first rider suggest a Parthian warrior, nevertheless, it is difficult to find an historical allusion in any part of these prophecies from chapter 4 to chapter 11.

A great number of writers, both ancient and modern, have identified the first rider with the rider on the white horse of chapter 19:11-16. This rider is called Faithful and True, and is none other than Christ. So the rider on the white horse in chap-

[19] A. Ramsay. (*Westminster New Testament*, 1910).
[20] Swete, *op. cit.*
[21] Charles, *op. cit.*, Vol I, p. 163.

ter 6:2 is either Christ himself or the victorious course of the Gospels. According to Mark 13:10, the Gospel must first be preached to all the nations before the Messianic woes begin. In the Apocalypse the first rider must ride through the whole world on his mission of conquest. When his message is rejected, then do the woes begin. This interpretation may be called "traditional" and can be traced from the time of Irenæus,[22] from the end of the second century, through Venerable Bede, Albert the Great,[23] and others to our own time. Catholic and Protestant writers, especially B. Weiss, J. Weiss and Hilgenfeld, at the present time, hold to this interpretation.

This is the only interpretation which truly saves the distinctive character of the first rider and, at the same time, fits in the episode of the horsemen with the plan of the Apocalypse. John, as can be seen in the very first chapter of his book, purports to put forth a new revelation which is revolutionary, a disclosure which will reveal the final secret of the End and of the things that precede the End. John reveals his picture in colors that were traditional, but he sees with new eyes. He used the language of the past, in great part, but he gave to this language a Christian signification and is testifying to his fellow Christians. The four horsemen, while traditional in language, must contain a new revelation, i.e., a Christian revelation. Where is the exclusively Christian revelation in the episode of the horsemen? The horsemen of war, of famine and of death are well known apocalyptic figures, equally at home in Jewish, or even, pagan apocalyptic thought and writing. The new thought is found in the first horseman. He gives a Christian tinge to the first four horsemen: without him, war, famine, and disease simply would be signs of the End but not christian signs of the End.

A cursory reading of the visions of the seals would seem to place the first horseman as the first in a series of four plagues but the context of the vision makes this more than doubtful. The second part of verse 8, the concluding part of the pericope, which sums up the devastations wrought by the plagues, forgets him. In that summation we have the sword of the second horseman, the famine of the third and the death of the fourth but neither the bow, nor the crown, nor the victory of the rider on

[22] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, IV, 21, 3.

[23] Albert the Great, *Enarrationes in Apocalypsim; Opera Omnia* (Paris: 1899).

the white horse. Nor is he called back or introduced into the chastisements executed by the four winds later on nor does he have a place in the woes announced by the sounding of the angelic trumpets. He is forgotten entirely in the series of woes that follow the opening of the seals.

Not only the context but the text puts the first rider in a category apart from the other riders. The brief analysis already given of the second verse shows that the first rider is distinct from the others, but a more thorough analysis will show just how distinct he is. There are four words in the second verse that characterize the first Rider, λευκός, τόξον, στέφανος, νικῶν.

The "crown" and the "bow" are not in themselves distinctive terms. In the Apocalypse "crown" is given indifferently to many personages, some of whom are the reverse of one another; to Christians, because of their royal priesthood (2:10; 3:2), to the twenty-four elders (4:4,10), to the infernal locusts (9:7), to the women representative of the Church (12:1), to the Beast of the Sea (13:1) and to the Word (19:2), although a different word is used for "crown" of the last three. The "bow" is not found elsewhere in the Apocalypse. It is clear that the "crown" can be attributed to Christ or to the Gospel personified. And "bow," taken over from the victorious Parthians, can signify victory. The two terms, "crown" and "bow," however, must be interpreted in relation to λευκός and νικῶν.

The terms, λευκός and νικῶν, have a very definite signification in the language of John. λευκός or white is a symbol of significance in the Apocalypse; we have the white hair of the Son of Man (1:14), the white stone bearing the new name (2:17), and the white garments (3:4,5,18),—all significative of Christian wisdom or Christian victory. White, as an emblem of victory, was well known in John's time. White was precious to the ancient mind, and if it did not signify something divine to the ancient world, it was considered, nevertheless, a propitious charm and a token of admission to religious and civil feasts.[24] During Roman triumphal feasts men donned white togas; the people put on white to signify their joy at the victory gained by the help of the gods.[24]

Νικάω is a Johannine word. It is used seven times in the Gospel and first Epistle and sixteen times in the Apocalypse.

[24] B. Allo, *L'Apocalypse*, p. 48.

It is only used four times in the rest of the New Testament. It is used in the Gospel and the First Epistle of the victory of Christ over his foes or of a victory gained by a member of Christ over the foes of Christ. The verb is used absolutely and also with an object. When it is used absolutely, it is always used of the victory of good over evil. In the Apocalypse it is used eleven times absolutely and five times with an object. Of the five times that it is used with an object only twice is it used of victory over good, and, even here, the triumph of evil is only temporary. In the eleven times it is used absolutely it is always used of the victory of good over evil, either of the victory of Christians over temptation, as at the end of each of the seven letters, or of victory in Christ as in 3:21, or of a victory that leads to Christ in heaven, as in 21:7. Hence, thirteen times out of sixteen it is used of victory over evil and of the eleven times it is used without an object it always means victory, either victory in Christ or the victory of Christ. In verse 2 of this chapter it is used without an object and, therefore, it should be taken, unless there is some positive reason to the contrary, of the victory of Christ.

The first Rider, therefore, signifies Christ or rather the progressive and continuous effect of Christ, i.e., the victorious course of the Gospel. The symbolism of 6:2 is essentially the symbolism of 19:11-16, but the symbolism of 19:11-16 portrays the Person of the Man-God and his activity as a teacher of souls, while the first rider of chap. 6 insists on the activity or grace of Christ in the souls of men during the course of the conflict. The first rider is not the Person of the Word, and that is why it is altogether fitting that he should be called up by one of the cherubim. If he were the Person of the Word it would not be so fitting. But if he is Christ, why is he introduced into a series of plagues? He is introduced in this series, which is a preparatory vision of things that will preceed the End, because Christ or the grace of the Gospel, in the revelation of John, is riding before and with the plagues. But John retains the scheme of four plagues and that is why, according to J. Weiss,[25] Hades is pictured as following death. We have five persons but the scheme of four plagues remains.

Extrinsically, this interpretation rests on good authority; it can be traced in wise and prudent authors from the earliest times

[25] J. Weiss, *Die Offenbarung Johannis,* (Göttingen: 1905).

to the present. Intrinsically, it seems to conform better to the text, context, and general thought of John than any other interpretation. With its help the majesty of the visional teaching of John, in all the chapters from 6 to 11, stands out boldly, namely, that after the rider on the white horse has made his ride, i.e., after the Gospel of mercy has been preached, then the final judgment can begin.

Dominican House of Studies
River Forest, Ill.

THE GOSPEL FOR THE FEAST OF THE GUARDIAN ANGELS

(Mt. 18:1-10).

Rev. John J. Collins, S.J., S.T.L.

The Gospel for this Feast of the Angels contains a lesson on the necessity and benefits of humility; then it sets forth the need of avoiding scandal; finally there is a warning against despising little ones, because they have the angels as their protectors.[1]

The Occasion for the Question

"At that hour the disciples came to Jesus, saying 'Who then is greatest in the kingdom of heaven'?" (18:1). The occasion for this question may have been merely the general attitude of the Apostles, who more than once discussed this matter and sought to secure the places of honor. Or they may have been moved to speak either by the payment of the tribute or the prophecy of the Passion, both incidents occurring at the end of the previous chapter. When the collectors of the temple tax had asked Simon whether his Master paid the tribute, Peter had answered, "Yes!" Later, our Lord had ordered Simon to "go to the sea, and cast in a hook and take the first fish that comes up. And opening its mouth thou wilt find a stater; take that and give it them for me and for thee" (17:26). This special favor shown to Peter led some of the Fathers[2] to think that this event aroused the envy of the Apostles and thus led to the present incident. Against this opinion is the fact that Mark (9:33) relates that they had disputed about this matter on the way before they reached Capharnaum, while from Matthew (17:23) it is clear that those collecting the dichrachma came to Peter after he entered that city. The payment of the tribute could not therefore have been the sole reason for the question of the Apostles. It might be possible to suppose that the Apostles disputed about the question on the way, that, coming to Capharnaum, they saw Peter honored in the payment of the tribute, and that they then asked their question.[3]

The other explanation of a special occasion which gives rise to the question of which is greater in the kingdom of heaven is that our Lord has just spoken previously about His death. He had so

[1] The same incident is related by Mk. 9:32-37 and Lk. 9:46-48. Both of them, however, omit the discussion about scandal and the guardian angels.

[2] Jerome, Euthymius, Bede, and St. Thomas. [3] Cf. Maldonatus.

often spoken of His death and foretold His Passion that they are wondering who shall take His place when He is gone. Just so men would wonder who might succeed to the position of a leader.[4] Later on when the Savior is going up to Jerusalem and predicts His Passion, the two sons of Zebedee ask for the first places in the kingdom (20:20-22), which they thought would commence gloriously after the Resurrection. Again, at the Last Supper, at the mention of His death, there arose a contention among the Apostles, as St. Luke mentions (Lk. 22:14-24). So now hearing just previously that the Savior is to die and rise again, and thinking that then the glorious kingdom will begin, they commence to dispute among themselves which of them will be the greater.[5]

Now, in regard to the occasion for the question, there are two objections, which may be raised. The first is that St. Matthew seems to contradict St. Mark. And the second is that St. Matthew seems to contradict himself. The difficulty about the narratives of St. Matthew and St. Mark is the following. Matthew speaks of the disciples asking Christ our Lord, which is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven. Mark on the other hand portrays the Apostles as being with the Lord in the house, probably Peter's, and our Lord Himself puts the question, "What were you arguing about on the way? But they kept silence, for on the way they had discussed with one another which of them was the greatest." These two accounts may be reconciled according to the principle frequently invoked for similar divergences. Either the same thing is said twice and on different occasions, or else one thing is said but narrated differently by the two evangelists. The same thing said twice can easily be explained, for Mark relates what occurred on the way, and Matthew could give what happens after they enter Capharnaum.[6] Another solution is to understand that the question is asked only once and as Mark relates it. Matthew, as frequently, narrates events briefly, because he is chiefly concerned with the teaching of Christ. Thus, while Mark gives the details, Matthew gives the matter summarily. And he is justified in saying that the Apostles asked the question, for the question was in their mind and the Lord read their thoughts.[7]

[4] Maldonatus. [5] Knabenbauer. [6] Chrysostom, Maldonatus.

[7] Knabenbauer, Lagrange. Another possible explanation is to say that Christ first asks the Apostles what they were disputing about. The apostles are silent, but later they take courage and ask the question themselves as Matthew relates. Cf. Knabenbauer.

The other objection comes from the consideration of what Matthew has previously related about the primacy of Peter. It would seem hardly possible that after Peter had been promised the first place in the Church, that any further discussion of the matter could arise. Two solutions can be given. One understands that the question has the promise of the primacy partly in view. The Apostles do not have courage enough to ask directly about that matter, but they put a general question. The meaning then is, "Who then, all things considered, will be first in the kingdom of heaven?"[8] They may be wondering whether it is really true that our Lord intended Peter to be the first. Another solution is based upon the events which followed the promise to Peter. He had been severely reprehended for his misguided attempt to prevent the Passion. Futhermore, in the Transfiguration James and John had shared honors with Simon.[9] So they might feel justified in asking that the Master declare now which of them will be the greatest in the kingdom.

WORLDLY AMBITION

"Who then is greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" The meaning of the verse depends upon the sense which is given to the words, the kingdom of heaven. That term may refer either to the kingdom as it is here upon earth or to its fulfilment in the future life. Some interpreters[10] understand the words to refer to heaven and beatitude. Thus, Chrysostom argues that they are not seeking anything earthly. They know that Peter is given the first place in the kingdom, as it is upon this earth. They wish to know who shall be first in the kingdom to come.

Against this interpretation it is objected that to seek first places in heaven is not something evil but good and proceeds from the love of God.[11] To this St. Thomas answers. "Are we not to seek eminence in the kingdom of heaven? We may say that one can have eminence in the kingdom of heaven in two ways. Either in the sense that we consider ourselves worthy of it, and this attitude is from pride and against the apostle (Phil. 2:3) 'in humility let each one regard the others as his superiors' etc. But to ask for greater grace that our glory may be greater is not evil, as in 1 Cor. 12:13 'strive after the greater gifts.' "

[8] Lagrange.
[9] Knabenbauer.
[10] Chrysostom, Euthym., Thomas.
[11] Maldonatus.

More common nowadays is the opinion that the Apostles are seeking honor not in heaven but in the Church upon this earth. This seems more in accord with the fact that our Lord's words contain a reprehension, that they themselves are ashamed to answer when questioned as St. Mark relates the event. Finally, they had false and earthly ideas of the kingdom and believe that it will soon be established gloriously upon this earth.[12]

OUR LORD'S ANSWER

Reading their thoughts the Savior replies not to their words, but to the disease in their heart.[13] "And Jesus called a little child to him, set it in the midst of them, and said, 'Amen I say to you, unless you turn and become like little children, you will not enter into the kingdom of heaven' " (18:2-3). How severe a blow this is to the self-esteem of the Apostles is clear from Chrysostom's paraphrase of the verse: Do not argue which of you is greater, and contend for the first places. I tell you that unless you become humble as a child, you will not be worthy to enter into the kingdom.

"Unless you turn." Some wrongly concluded from these words that the Apostles were in a state of mortal sin. But our Lord wished only to signify that humility is a necessary condition for entrance into the kingdom of heaven. He does not imply that the Apostles are lacking that virtue, but simply points out how necessary it is. So that if they have it not, they must get it. If they possess that virtue, they must preserve it by all means.[14]

The Apostles are taught that they must become like little children, not in age, but that they may acquire by industry what children have by their years.[15] The virtues of the child are principally humility, simplicity, and lack of arrogance. "For the child is without envy and vainglory and love for first places. And he possesses the greatest virtue, guilelessness and simplicity and humility. Not only courage and prudence, therefore, is needed, but this virtue as well, humility I mean and simplicity."[16] All are to become like little children, but this does not mean complete uniformity, but only that the highest example is set before them for imitation. There will be varying degrees of humility among

[12] Knabenbauer.
[13] Chrysostom.
[14] Maldonatus.
[15] Cf. Jerome.
[16] Chrysostom.

men. Similarly we are urged to become perfect as our heavenly Father is perfect.[17]

"You will not enter into the kingdom of heaven." Humility is needed both to enter the Church and to remain in it. For faith requires humility, since the mind must accept mysteries which surpass human reason. The proud mind is far from the humility of faith as our Lord testified: "How can you believe who receive glory from one another, and do not seek the glory which is from the only God?" (Jn. 5:44). And that one may remain in the Church it is evident that there is need of obedience and humility.[18]

Next, Christ our Lord sets down the general principle which should govern their entire lives. They are seeking greatness. Here is the true source and test of greatness, humility. "Whoever, therefore, humbles himself as this little child, he is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven" (18:4). Adults by their eager striving can attain what children have by nature. Humility and considering oneself as the least are qualities present in a child almost by necessity. For the little one is weak, ignorant of many things, always needing the help and the care of others, and nothing about the world's ambition is known to him. In grown men, however, there are many stumblingblocks to this virtue of humility. The most elevated in dignity nevertheless can like Paul[19] find the secret of humbling himself after the example of Christ who "humbled himself, becoming obedient to death, even to death on a cross" Phil. 2:8).

Here St. Thomas raises the question about charity. "For it seems that this is not true [that whoever humbles himself is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven], because perfection consists in charity. Therefore where there is greater charity, there is greater perfection. We may answer that humility necessarily accompanies charity, and you can see this, if you consider one who is humble. For just as there are two elements in pride, inordinate love and inordinate esteem of oneself, so, on the contrary, in humility, because the humble man is not concerned for his own excellence. Likewise, he does not consider himself worthy. That follows necessarily upon charity. Every man desires the excellence which he loves. Therefore, the more humility a man has, so much the more does he love God and condemns his

[17] Maldonatus. [18] Knabenbauer; cf. St. Thomas. [19] Phil. 4:12.

own excellence the more and so much the less does he ascribe to himself. And thus the more charity a man has, the more humility he has as well."

RECEIVING THE LITTLE ONES

Our Lord has shown the necessity of humility and indicated its advantages. Now he proceeds to show that not only may they become humble, but that they may have a reward for receiving those who are humble and lowly.[20] "And whoever receives one such little child for my sake, receives me" (18:5). *Receives* here means not only to take a person into one's home, but to do him good in any way. As in the Last Judgment it is said, "as long as you did it for one of these, the least of my brethren, you did it for me" (Mt. 25:40). "One such little child" includes not only children but also those who are lowly and humble. By a child here he means "men who are simple and humble and contemned by the world and despised." Chrysostom says: "That the lowly and despised are principally or largely in mind, all admit. A minor question is whether our Lord speaks directly and immediately of a child or of one who has become like a child." Knabenbauer thinks that a child is meant directly and immediately. He argues from the fact that our Lord has put a little child in their midst and then speaks of "one such little child." Furthermore, there is the parallel in Mk. 9:35-36. He "took a little child, and set it in the midst of them, and taking it into his arms, he said to them, 'Whoever receives one such little child for my sake, receives me.'" And St. Luke (9:47-48) has the same idea. He "took a little child and set it beside him, and said to them, 'Whoever receives this little child for my sake, receives me.'" The objection may be raised that Matthew speaks of "these little ones who believe in me" (v. 6), which might seem to refer to the faithful who are adults.[21] But the phrase "who believe in me" can refer to children who have reached the age of reason, and yet are of tender years.[22] Most authors[23] take the phrase "one such little child" to refer directly to those who have become like children in their humility and lowliness. At any rate the poor and despised are certainly included either directly or by an implicit consideration a pari.[24]

[20] Cf. Chrysostom.
[21] Lagrange.
[22] Knabenbauer, in v. 6.
[23] Cf. Lagrange.
[24] Knabenbauer.

"For my sake." Literally in my name. By the name a person is made known and designated. Thus, the name of God is often put for all that God has revealed about Himself. Therefore, the reason for the care given the little ones should not be natural love and good will, but Christ, i.e., whatever is known to us about Christ and His will. Thus, the knowledge, example and teaching of Christ will beget and animate this zeal for helping the little ones of the world.[25]

For the Apostles' care of little ones the Savior promises a reward. It is that "one who receives one of these little ones receives me." Mark adds, and "whoever receives me, receives not me but him who sent me" (Mk. 9:36). "The mind of all the speakers is that he who receives one who has become as a child, through him receives me, and through me receives my Father who sent me. For the Father considers my honor his own, while I consider as mine the honor shown to one become like a child" (Euthymius). And the greatest reward of all is this, that one receives the Holy Trinity. "What then can be more blessed than this receiving [a little child] by which one receives the Blessed Trinity. Or if he receives the Son and the Father, certainly he receives the Holy Ghost as well. Because the divine Trinity is indivisible. But it was not yet the moment then to teach them about the Holy Ghost" (Euthymius).

Three conclusions may be drawn from this verse. The first is that of St. Jerome who indicates that in the words, receive for My sake, there is something to humble the Apostles. When men show them honor, they should realize it is not on their account, but for the sake of the Master whom men seek to honor. The second conclusion is a warning to the Apostles. They will be the leaders of the flock and they should make themselves the lowest of all by their humility. Nevertheless, in the Church there will be other little ones, lowly persons who will not enjoy positions of honor nor have the same lights as the Apostles. For these the Apostles must be concerned, and they must take care not to scandalize them.[26] A third conclusion is the encouragement given to the Apostles, to do a work considered of little value in the eyes of the world. Children and those who are abject and despised need special care. But the work of caring for them can easily be judged by men of the world as a waste of time.[27]

[25] Knabenbauer. [26] Lagrange. [27] Knabenbauer.

SCANDALIZING LITTLE ONES

The reward for any benefit done to these little ones has been stated. Next, he makes clear how one who harms these little ones shall be punished.[28] "But whoever causes one of these little ones who believe in me to sin, it were better for him to have a great millstone hung around his neck, and to be drowned in the depths of the sea" (18:6). Chrysostom notes that there is here a break in the perfect sequence of thought. The "sequence to what precedes would be. He who does not receive one of these little ones, does not receive me, which is more bitter than any punishment. But since they were most insensible and unfeeling, and this penalty, though terrible, did not affect them, he sets before them the millstone and the drowning in the sea."

Of any mortal sin it may be said that it is better to suffer any temporal punishment in the present life than to suffer eternal punishment. For as St. Paul tells us, "It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God" (Heb. 10:31). And Susanna's words could be repeated by all, it "is better for me to fall into your hands without doing it, than to sin in the sight of the Lord" (Dan. 13:23). But the sin of causing one of the little ones to sin is so heinous that it deserves to have a punishment altogether extraordinary. St. Jerome made an application of the principle to the Apostles. For if they had continued to contend about honor, they might have scandalized those whom they were converting and thus caused their converts to lose their souls.[30] "Causes to sin," literally scandalize, is taken by Chrysostom in the sense of dishonoring. Whoever dishonors the weak and abject. "A great millstone" is literally an ass millstone, one which is turned by an ass in contrast to a stone which a man can turn by hand.

St. Thomas mentions the objection that the little ones are those who are perfect, and the perfect cannot be scandalized. He answers that the perfect may be those who are such either in actuality or in process of being. The former cannot be scandalized, but the latter can. Another solution is to understand that scandal may be given, even though the other person may not take the scandal, because he does not suffer any harm.

[28] Cf. Chrysostom.
[29] St. Thomas.
[30] Jerome.

AVOIDING SCANDAL

Scandal, being so terrible, every effort should be made to avoid it. "Woe to the world because of scandals! For it must needs be that scandals come, but woe to the man through whom scandal does come!" (18:7). "Scandals" here is to be taken in a generic sense. St. Hilary speaks only of the scandal of the Cross, which he said must come that man may be redeemed. Scandals must come. Not from absolute necessity, but considering the wickedness of men.[31] The Greek Fathers carefully explain that this statement about the necessity of scandals does not take away the culpability of men. Neither does it do away with the guilt of those who are scandalized. "That scandals should come is necessary, but it is not at all necessary to be destroyed by them. Just as if a doctor should say . . . this disease must come, but it is not at all necessary to die from it" (Chrysostom). Some might ask why does not Christ destroy those who will cause scandals. "It is not for that reason that those who are scandalized are lost, but from their own negligence. The virtuous make this clear, not only not being harmed by this, but greatly profiting from it. Such was Job. Such was Joseph. Such were all the just and the Apostles. But if many are lost, that is from their own fault" (Chrysostom).

"Woe to the man through whom scandal does come!" By this general sentence he strikes Judas who had made his mind ready for the betrayal.[32]

The necessity of avoiding scandal is developed by setting forth particular instances. Things which are as dear as the hand or foot or eye must be sacrificed, if necessary, to save one's soul. If to save his life a man would not hesitate to sacrifice a member, it ought to be the same to enter into eternal life.[33] The hand, and foot and eye mean anyone near and dear to us, friends, relatives or helpers. "And if thy hand or thy foot is an occasion of sin to thee, cut it off and cast it from thee! It is better for thee to enter life maimed or lame, than, having two hands or two feet, to be cast into the everlasting fire" (18:8). He says "if anyone is united to thee as thy hand and foot and eye . . . but causes thee scandal and on account of his evil life draws thee to hell, it is

[31] St. Thomas.
[32] Jerome, Bede.
[33] Lagrange.

better to lack his presence and the worldly advantages from him lest, while you desire to win your relatives and kinsmen, you have the cause of ruin. Therefore neither brother, nor wife, nor sons, nor friends, nor any affection which can exclude us from the kingdom of heaven is to be put before the love of God" (Jerome). And the Great Doctor concludes with an exhortation to self examination. "Everyone of the faithful knows what harms him, or in what the soul is . . . often tempted. It is better to lead a life of solitude, than on account of the ties of this present life to lose life eternal."[34]

GUARDIAN ANGELS

Finally, we come to the mention of the angels. "See that you do not despise one of these little ones; for I tell you, their angels in heaven always behold the face of my Father in heaven." The connection seems to be an added reason given for showing due consideration to children and the lowly. St. Thomas and St. Jerome give slightly different connections. St. Thomas says that he has previously told them to avoid scandal on account of the penalty. Here he teaches them to avoid it from a consideration of divine providence. St. Jerome thinks also that this part is connected with what has been said before about scandal. He understands that we are to avoid the occasion of sin, to hate the sin, but not to despise the sinner nor fail to help him where possible. "As far as in you lies, do not contemn, but by your salvation seek also their well being. If, however, you see them persevering in sin and slaves of their vices, it is better for you to be saved alone, than to perish with many" (Jerome).

How dangerous it is to contemn little ones who have such powerful protectors! For their prayer are daily offered by the angels through Christ to God. A similar idea is found in the Old Testament in regard to the widow. "Do not the widow's tears run down the cheek, and her cry against him that causeth them to fall? For from the cheek they go up even to heaven, and the Lord that heareth will not be delighted with them" (Ecclus. 33:18-19).[35]

[34] Jerome.

[35] St. Thomas also adds. "Or their angels, because they are fellow citizens of them, because there is one society of angels and men. Hence, they are fellow citizens of the heavenly city."

From the text of Matthew comes the doctrine about guardian angels. Chrysostom and Jerome mention it in commenting on this verse. "It is clear that all the saints (i.e., all Christians) have angels. For the apostle says about women that they ought to have a veil over their head on account of the angels." The doctrine is thus explained by Knabenbauer. From the O.T. it is clear that angels were set over peoples and provinces as guardians. Thus, for the Jews it is said "Behold I will send my angel who shall go before thee, and keep thee in thy journey, and bring thee into the place that I have prepared" (Ex. 23:20). And the Persians have an angel guardian. "But the prince of the kingdom of the Persians resisted me one and twenty days" (Dan. 10:13). The special protector of the Jews is St. Michael. "But at that time shall Michael rise up, the great prince, who standeth for the children of thy people" (Dan. 12:1). Angels assisted not only the people in general but the just in particular in time of danger, e.g., Agar (Gen. 16:7) and Abraham (Gen. 24:7) and Jacob (Gen. 32:1) and Elias (3 Kgs. 19:5) and Tobias (3:25). By the present statement of our Lord about the angels of the little ones the doctrine is extended further. So that the common opinion holds with St. Jerome that each soul receives a guardian angel at the time of birth.[36]

These angels "always behold the face of my Father." Not that the angels of others than the little ones do not behold the face of God, but the phrase for the Hebrews simply means that one is near and familiar to God. The metaphor is taken from court life in which the more honored a person is, the nearer he is to the king and the more frequently he was in his sight. For that reason the queen of Saba speaks of Solomon's servants, "Blessed are thy men, and blessed are thy servants, who stand before thee always, and hear thy wisdom" (3 Kgs. 10:8).[37] A theological conclusion can be drawn from the fact that the angels always look upon the face of Christ, namely that they always carry their beatitude with them wherever they are. The Face of God is a metaphor for the splendor of the divine essence, as the face of a man is that in which his whole person shines forth.[38]

[36] Jerome. cf. Knabenbauer.

[37] Maldonatus. "The angels see the face of God, i.e., they form the celestial court" (Lagrange).

[38] Maldonatus.

In conclusion, the Gospel for the Feast of the Guardian Angels contains the beautiful teaching on humility and the consoling doctrine of the protectors whom God has appointed to care for those who are children or who by their efforts become like to these little ones.

Weston College
Weston, Mass.

WHO IS 'THE BOY' IN ISAIAS 7:16?

Rev. Thomas E. Bird, S.T.D., Ph.D.

In Isaias, 8:4, the prophet states that it has been revealed to him by God that: "Before the boy (*na'ar*) shall be able to say 'my father' and 'my mother,' the wealth of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be carried away before the king of the Assyrians."

All commentators agree that this boy is the newly-born Maher-shalal-hash-baz, Isaias's second son.

In 7:16 Isaias says: "Before the boy (*na'ar*) shall be able to reject evil and choose good, the land, of whose two kings thou (Achaz) art in dread, shall be forsaken."

In 8:18 he says: "Behold, I and the children, whom Yahweh has given to me for signs and portents in Israel, from *Yahweh* of hosts, who dwells in mount Sion."

The suggestion of this article is that the boy referred to in 7:16 is the prophet's first child, Shear-yashub. Thus both sons are mentioned in similar passages, and both are for signs and portents of what is to come to pass. From this suggestion it follows that the Son of the Virgin, mentioned in 7:14 is quite a distinct person from the boy of verse 16. The former is Emmanuel (Christ) and He alone; the latter is Shear-yashub, Isaias' son.

Let us first look at the historical situation. By the year 735 B.C. the two kingdoms, Israel (Ephraim) and Syria, had made an alliance in order to strengthen themselves against the Assyrians. The coalition decided that the kingdom of Juda must be brought into the alliance; and when Achaz, king of Juda, refused to be cajoled, it was determined that he should be deposed, by force of arms, and replaced by a certain Ben-Tabeel—probably a Syrian.

When this information was reported to the House of David, Achaz was terrified: "His heart shook, and the heart of his people, as the trees of a forest are shaken by a wind." Then, anxious to safeguard the city's water-supply, in the event of a siege, he went out to inspect the aqueduct at Fuller's Field Road. It was to this spot that Isaias was directed by God to go in order to urge the despondent king to put aside his fears. But notice, the prophet is not to go alone; *he is to take his son Shear-yashub*

with him. That the boy was to be present at the interview was by divine command. Obviously there was a purpose in this.

"And Yahweh said to Isaias: Go forth now to meet Achaz, thou, and Shear-yashub thy son."

Many commentators pass over this divine command, as though the taking of the boy had little or no significance. Others say that the boy's presence would remind the king that "a remnant shall return (to God)," which was the meaning of the child's name. But, we may ask, what influence would this have on an irreligious and politically-minded king? If anything, the very idea that there was to be "a remnant" would convince the king that disaster awaited the majority of his subjects.

When Isaias, with his son, met the king at Fuller's Field Road, the prophet gave Achaz God's message: he is to keep calm and have no fear of those "two tail-ends of smouldering fire-brands," the king of Syria and the king of Israel, because their designs against the kingdom of Juda shall miscarry:

"Thus said the Lord, Yahweh: It shall not stand, it shall not be."

No, Rasin, king of Syria, shall not rule beyond his capital city of Damascus, and Phacee, king of Ephraim, shall not rule beyond his capital city of Samaria; neither of them shall ever rule from the throne of David; and, indeed, within sixty-five years Ephraim shall be so broken up as to be no longer a nation.[1] Quoting what was probably a well known saying and pun, Isaias added:

[1] The critics dismiss this verse as "a gloss" (blessed word!); but even the glossator must have had a reason for inserting it. To exclude it on the ground that it spoils the sequence between vv. 8,9 is arbitrary; to say that the dating of predictions is alien to the style of Isaias is incorrect, cf. 16:14; 20:3; 21:16; 23:17; 35:5; to read: "Yet six, nay, five years more, and Syria shall be shattered, Ephraim diminished" (Kissane) is to tamper with the text without the support of any version; to argue that "it could afford Achaz little assurance that the present peril was unreal, to know that long after he was dead Ephraim would be destroyed" (Gray) is to miss the point, which is that the kingdom of David will survive, while Ephraim will have disappeared within 65 years. And, indeed, before 65 years had passed, the kingdom of the ten tribes was so broken up, that it ceased to be a nation, and Esarhaddon introduced foreign colonists to occupy its cities (4 Kings 17:23; 24:1; 1 Esdras 4:2,10). "Tiglath-pileser commenced, Shalmaneser continued, and Esarhaddon completed the ruin of the two states of Samaria and Syria" (Calmet).

"If ye believe not, yea, ye shall have no security."[2] Without faith, no stability.

Isaias paused. His words had fallen on deaf ears. Achaz had thoroughly made up his mind that he would rely on help from Assyria, and no religious appeal would make him change it. Yet the patience of God was not exhausted. Through the mouth of His prophet, He made an astounding offer to Achaz, to prove the permanency of the House of David. Let the king ask for a miracle to be wrought; let him choose as stupendous a miracle as he wished; any "sign" he liked, and anywhere in creation, from the lowest part of Sheol to the highest part of the heavens. Never in the whole history of religion was a man so favoured.

But the politician would not listen to the *navi'*—the man of God. Suddenly Achaz replied: "I will not ask, nor will I put Yahweh to the proof." The hypocrisy in this reply, and its rejection of the amazing offer stung the prophet to indignation. He denounced Achaz and his princes for exhausting not merely human patience (a small matter), but the patience of God Himself (a grievous matter indeed); and to emphasize the king's lack of faith, he spoke no longer of "thy God" but of "my God."

Then, addressing the House of David of all time, Isaias gave God's own proof of the indefectibility of the throne of David; he foretold the birth of a God-with-us Child, who will one day occupy the Davidic throne. He said:

"Behold, the MAID shall conceive and bring forth a SON, and she shall call His name EMMANUEL. Curds and honey shall He eat, that he may know to reject evil and to choose good."[3] There is no need to follow some Catholic commentators who translate *hinneh* (Behold) by "Suppose that" or "If (the Virgin)"—a very rare use of the word, and never found in Isaias in the many instances where *hinne* occurs.[4] Nor need we spend time refuting those rationalists who deny that an *'alma* is a

[2] Cf. 2 Par. 20:20. Commentators suppose that the words refer to the incredulity of Achaz. In our opinion, Isaias is applying the saying to the destruction of idolatrous Samaria (and Syria).

[3] Lamedh here has its usual sense, sufficiently represented by Vulgate *ut* and contained in LXX πρὶν ἢ; the translation "when" is incorrect.

[4] The closest parallels to the Isaian text are Gen. 16:11: "Behold thou shalt conceive and bear a son, and thou shalt call his name Yishmael"; Judges 13:5: "Behold, thou shalt conceive and bear a son" (Samson), also *vv.* 3 and 7.

virgin, for this has already been done, and well done, by Dr. J. E. Steinmueller, in this *Quarterly*.[5] The word means an unmarried woman of marriageable age, an excellent term for "a virgin betrothed to a man" (Lk. 1:27).

Notice the article before *'alma*—"*the* MAID." Obviously Isaias was reminding Achaz of a child-bearing Woman well known in Jewish tradition—the Woman mentioned in Gen. 3:15, and by Isaias' contemporary Michaeas 5:3.[6] What the Isaian prophecy added to the existing tradition and revelation was that the Woman was to be an unmarried maid—a virgin. The sign promised to the House of David was the miracle of a virgin-birth, added to which, it was revealed that the Child would be God-with-us. The prophecy made near the aqueduct at Fuller's Field Road is summed up in the two words 'alma and Emmanuel. St. Matthew (1:23, and cf. Luke 1:31,35) was not indulging in a fanciful or "spiritual" interpretation when he introduced the text of Is. 7:14; he was proving the Virgin-birth *ex Sacra Scriptura* from a text that spoke of the one and only virginal conception that has ever taken place on earth.[7]

It matters little who is to give the Child the descriptive name of Emmanuel. The pointed Hebrew text says that it will be His mother; the unpointed text could read: "thou (the House of David)," and so the Greek translators rendered it; the Vulgate and Syriac translate by the passive: "vocabitur"; St. Matthew has "vocabunt."

But the next sentence matters a great deal. It says that Emmanuel shall eat "curds (or curdled milk) and honey." What does this signify? Commentator after commentator, misled by the irony in verse 22, have followed one another in saying that this means that the Child will be brought up in poverty. With the cognate expression: "flowing with milk and honey," indicative of peace and plenty, in their minds, it is difficult to see how these commentators could have interpreted this passage of Isaias in so contrary a sense. Never once in Sacred Scripture

[5] Vol. II, pp. 28-43 (January 1940). The LXX. translators, the Syriac translators, and St. Matthew knew that an *'alma* was a virgin. There is not a whit of evidence anywhere to show that a young married woman is meant.

[6] On this point of Jewish tradition, see Canon Arendzen's paper in the vol. *Our Blessed Lady* (p. 10), Cambridge Summer School Lectures, 1933.

[7] Matthew would have learnt this from Christ Himself; Lk. 24:45.

is milk or honey associated with poverty.[8] And Holy Church has taken milk and honey as symbols of richness. Adapting the prophecy of Joel 3:18, she sings of the happiness of Messianic times with the words:

"In illa die stillabunt montes dulcedinem, et colles fluent lac et mel, alleluia,"[9] and it was her custom, in the early ages, to give to the newly-baptized a mixture of milk and honey as a foretaste of the spiritual joys in store for them.[10]

What, then, is meant when it is said that Emmanuel shall eat curds and honey that he may know to reject evil and choose good? It may mean that He will come as the Prince of Peace, and will bring prosperity into the world. Or it may be a figurative expression telling us that the Child will grow strong, filled with wisdom and the grace of God (Lk. 2:40,52). But there is another interpretation that must not lightly be set aside. The Babylonians regarded curds and honey as food of the gods; so did the Greeks and the Latins.[11] There is no suggestion that Isaias deliberately borrowed from Babylonian or other sources; the simple fact is that throughout the East these foods were associated with infant-gods. Isaias does not mean that Emmanuel will actually eat curdled milk and honey; he uses the phrase figuratively, to denote that the SON of the MAID will be a divine Child; He will really be EMMANUEL, God with us.

Now the prophecy of the Maid's Son ends, in our opinion, at verse 15. Nothing more is said about Emmanuel in chapter 7. In the following chapter, however, the prophet, foreseeing "the waters of the River" (Assyria) rushing like a torrent to overwhelm Juda, describes them as covering "the entire width of thy land, O Emmanuel" (8:8); and in chapter 9 he prophesies that the Assyrian invasion will not spell the final extinction of the House of David, for a great light will follow on the darkness—the Child Emmanuel will be born:

[8] Cf. Gen. 18:8; 49:12; Deut. 32:13,14; Jdgs. 5:25; 2 Sam. 17:28; Job 20:17; 29:6; C. C. 4:11; Ecclus. 29:31; also 4 Esdras 2:19.

[9] Second vespers of 1st Sunday of Advent.

[10] Cf. Tertullian, *De Corona Militis* 3; *Canones Hippolyti* c. 148—quoted by Fr. E. Power, S.J., in *Verbum Domini* 1922, p. 56; though, strange to say, Fr. Power seems to regard the words in Isaias as indicative of poverty: "Apparet tamen e contextu terram ab hostibus vastatum iri."

[11] See Calmet *ad loc.;* Power *art. cit.;* R. Kittel *Die hellenistische Mysterien-religionen und das Alte Testament.* (I have been unable to consult this last named).

"For a Child is born to us,
A Son is given to us,
Invested with royal authority.
And His name shall be called:
Wonderful Counsellor, Mighty God,
Father for ever, Prince of peace!"

Let us now return to 7:16, to Achaz and Isaias, standing near the aqueduct, and especially to Shear-yashub, the boy, who, by express command of God, is present at the interview. I translate verse 16: "Yea, before the boy (*na'ar*) shall be able to reject evil and choose good, the land, of whose two kings thou art in dread, shall be forsaken."

Notice that we render *ki* by 'Yea.' This intensive or emphatic force of the word is not uncommon ("yea," "indeed," "surely"); we have two other occurences in this same chapter, vv. 9,22.

The text and versions make it quite clear that "the land" referred to in the passage is the land of Syria and Israel. Yet the critics (Catholics as well as non-Catholics) twist, change or omit words in order to make the prophecy speak of the land of Juda. But there is no need to interfere with the sacred text at all; before "the boy" has grown to the use of reason, Tiglathpileser had marched forward to Samaria, ravaged the northern provinces of Israel, and (two years later, 732 B.C.) after forcing Damascus to capitulate, had deported its inhabitants.

The important question, however, to answer is: Who is "the boy?" Most commentators say that he is the son of the Maid mentioned in the previous verse. Hence the typico-messianic exegesis, which identifies Emmanuel first with some child contemporary with the prophet, as a type of the true Emmanuel of the future; while some woman living in the year 734 B.C.—"Isaias' wife," "Achaz' wife," "any young woman who was soon to become a mother," "an unnamed Jewish damsel"—was to be a type of the blessed Virgin Mary.[12] How an ordinary woman

[12] The idea that Isaias had a son named Emmauel, who was a type of Christ, was proposed by an unnamed commentator in St. Jerome's time, but the Doctor dismissed it with a mere passing reference: "Quidam de nostris Isaiam prophetam duos filios habuisse contendit, Jasub et Emmanuel, et Emmauel de prophetissa uxore ejus esse generatum, in typum Domini Salvatoris" (*In Is.* MPL t. 24, col 112). Calmet revived the idea, with the modification that under the name Emmanuel "deux personnages" are represented, the first being the Messias, and the second, His type, being the

giving birth to a child by an ordinary husband could possibly be a "type" of a virgin mother is never explained. Surely this is not the sense in which St. Matthew understood the prophecy! Again, if the first reference was to a child about to be born of Isaias' or Achaz' wife, how did the prophet know that it would be a boy?

No, the prophecy of the Virgin Birth of Emmanuel, who is to sustain the throne of David in spite of all attacks, is complete in itself and ends with verse 15. Connected only somewhat with it (for the conquest of Ephraim and Syria by the Assyrians would relieve the threat to the House of David, for the time being) is the prophet's announcement that Ephraim and Syria are shortly to be devastated: "Yea, before the boy Shear-yashub, who is present here, by divine command, comes to the use of reason, the territory of the two kings, of whom you are in dread, shall be laid waste."[13]

Let us now consider the phrase, "before the boy shall be able to reject evil and choose good," for this expression has been tortured by commentators to suit their interpretations. The phrase simply means what it does in other languages, namely the attain-

---

boy mentioned in 8:3. (*Commentaire* t. 5., p. 639, edit. 1726). Billot, following Le Hir, regarded the Virgin as both our Lady and Isaias' wife, and Emmauel as both Christ and the boy of 8:3 (*La Parousie* p. 64). Fr. Eric Burrows, S.J., put forward a similar interpretation, but would not identify the typical Emmanuel with Isaias' son: "in our view it is not necessary to identify the typical child. He need not have been personally famous" (*Oracles of Jacob and Balaam,* p. 81). Our contention is that Isaias never though of any married woman as a type of the Immaculate Virgin Mother, nor of any child of his time who would even dimly typify Christ Emmanuel. The Maid was *solely* the Virgin Mary, and the divine Emmanuel was *solely* Christ our Lord.

[13] In the course of writing this article I discovered that the suggestion is not new. Condamin (*Le Livre d'Eaie,* p. 70) mentions that it was proposed by Maran and Drach. I have not been able to consult these writers. Evidently they supposed that Isaiah pointed to Shear-yashub with a gesture. This is ridiculed by Condamin, who likens it to the Protestant interpretation of the *Tu es Petrus* text. He adds: "De pareils gestes . . . ne sont pas admis en saine exégèse." But sane exegesis must also take into consideration the fact that God must have had a special reason for commanding that Shear-yashub should be present at the interview. Condamin also appeals to *ki* as connective; but, as we have seen above, it has here the meaning "yea." Condamin's own explanation of the prophecy is based on giving *hinneh* (Behold) the meaning 'If (the Virgin)' etc., which we regard as a most improbable translation of the word.

ment of the use of reason, about the age of six or seven years.[14] What Isaias is saying is that before Shear-yashub, now three or four years old,[15] reaches the age of six or seven, the land will be forsaken, just as later (8:4) he will say that before Maher-shalal-hash-baz is a year old (before he can say "dada" and "mamma") the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be carried away by the Assyrians.

Isaias' interview with Achaz may be placed in the year 735. Ephraim was ravaged by Tiglath-pileser at the end of the year 734, and two years later Damascus capitulated and its inhabitants were deported. All this points to Shear-yashub as the boy.

The supporters of the typico-messianic interpretation find themselves in a quandary here. Those who keep to the Hebrew text and interpret the land as the territory of the two kings, have to say that before the typical Emmanuel is three years old, the devastation will have been completed. A precocious child, to come to the use of reason before his third birthday! Others, who interpret "the land" as that of Juda, have to say that coming to the use of reason means reaching man's estate. For the Assyrians did not ravage Juda until more than thirty years after the interview in Fuller's Field Road. This would spell not precocity but retarded development![16]

After prophesying the permanency of the House of David, owing to the Virgin Birth of Emmanuel, and the defeat of the kings of Ephraim and Syria before Shear-yashub will have come to the age of reason, Isaias foretold the punishment that would come upon Juda, owing to Achaz' incredulity. Yahweh shall whistle for "the fly" (figure of Egypt) to come from the Nile, and for "the bee" of Assyria; and they shall come in swarms and settle all over Juda. And the irony of the situation will be that the very king of Assyria, whom Achaz will "hire" for help, will become the "razor" that will shave off all the hair and the beard of Juda!

[14] Cf. Deut. 1:39; 2 Sam. 19:35; Ps. 36 (35):5.

[15] So Kissane, *Book of Isaiah*, vol. I. p. 80.

[16] Grey, *I. C. C.* p. 131 supposes that the phrase refers to the power to distinguish between palatable and unpalatable food. Kissane (*l. c.*, p. 92) supposes that it implies that when Emmanuel has reached the age of Achaz, he will have before him the lesson to be derived from his experience of the dire results of the policy of Achaz. This is reading into the text what is not there.

So desolate and devastated will the land become, that a farmer will only possess a young cow and two sheep. Then, *irony again*:

"It shall come to pass that owing to the abundance of milk, he shall eat curds. Yea, curds and honey shall every one eat who is left in the midst of the land!" Delicious foods, foods of the gods, for a God-forsaken people!

The land will go out of cultivation; briars and brambles will grow where once the richest vines flourished. Wild beasts will prowl about, and the few hungry inhabitants will hunt them for food. An ox and a sheep will be the sole occupants of the once cultivated hills.

The Immaculate Virgin is incomparable, except, in a sublime manner, with the first Eve. That is why, I think, passages that prophesy of her will not bear typical interpretations—the Woman passage in Genesis 3:15; the Virgin passage in Isaias 7:14,15, the Mother passage in Micheas 5:2,3; the Heavenly Queen passage in the Apocalypse c. 12. It is significant that when the Church recites the Isaian passage as a lesson in holy Mass, she closes it with verse 15.[17]

English Martyrs Rectory
Sparkhill, Birmingham, England

[17] Ember Wednesday in Advent, the Annunciation, Votive Mass (I).

"NON GUSTABUNT MORTEM"

Rev. Anthony C. Cotter, S.J., S.T.D.

According to the eschatological school, which flourished around the turn of the century and is by no means dead today, our Lord thought and taught that the end of the world was at hand, that it would come during His own lifetime or soon after. They infer this from some of His sayings which are scattered through the Synoptic Gospels. I discussed one or two of them in this Quarterly some years ago.[1] I there examined the structure of the so-called eschatological discourse, and showed that it easily falls into four parts (except for the introduction) which are indeed related, yet refer to two distinct events. I also showed that if this division is adhered to, our Lord cannot be charged with such an erroneous belief.[2]

I now propose to examine another of our Lord's sayings, which, though not part of the eschatological discourse, has been given an eschatological twist by rationalists. It is contained in all three Synoptics, though not in exactly the same words. And since this verbal difference has a bearing on the exegesis of the text, I first cite the three passages (according to our new version), italicizing the end phrases, in which alone the differences appear:

Matthew 16:28 "Amen I say to you, there are some of those standing here who will not taste death, till they have seen *the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.*"

Mark 8:39 (or 9:1) "And he said to them, Amen I say to you, there are some of those standing here who will not taste death, till they have seen the *kingdom of God coming in power.*"[3]

Luke 9:27 "But I say to you truly, there are some of those standing here who will not taste death, till they have seen *the kingdom of God.*"

[1] I (1939), pp. 125-132, 204-213.

[2] A like division of the discourse is advocated by Fr. Segarra in the Gregorianum (1937-8) and by Fr. Vaccari in *Verbum Domini* (1939, p. 375).

[3] Note that the Greek here has the past participle (ἐληλυθυῖαν) for "coming." Fr. Joüon (*L'Evangile de N.-S. Jésus-Christ*, p. 231) thinks that this corresponds more closely to the Aramaic original than Matthew's present participle.

Catholic commentators agree that the passage is very obscure, especially if the three versions of the saying are compared with one another. Simón calls it a "textus sane difficilis"; Fillion, "a mysterious form of speech"; Prat, "une parole mystérieuse"; van Steenkiste, "verba obscurissima"; Dean in the Westminster Version says that it has "ever been an exegetical crux." It is the purpose of this article to shed some light on it, if possible, and to determine what our Lord really meant to predict. But to have a solid scriptural foundation for our exegesis, we shall do well to consider first its context, genuinity and historicity.

1. The Context

A remarkable thing about this *logion* is its context. In all three Synoptic Gospels it follows an *exhortation to self-denial,* which, in Matthew and Mark, follows the rebuke given to Peter for his refusal to understand and accept the divine plan of Redemption through the cross. In all three Gospels, too, it is immediately followed by the *Transfiguration,* which occurred "after six days" (Mt. and Mk.) or after "about 8 days" (Lk.). For the benefit of those who have not the Gospel at their elbow, I quote the whole passage according to Matthew (16:24–17:1); the other two accounts do not differ materially.

> Then Jesus said to his disciples, If anyone wishes to come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me. For he who would save his life will lose it; but he who loses his life for my sake will find it. For what does it profit a man if he gain the whole world, but suffer the loss of his own soul? Or what will a man give in exchange for his soul? For the Son of Man is to come with his angels in the glory of his Father, and then he will render to everyone according to his conduct. Amen I say to you, there are some of those standing here who will not taste death, till they have seen the Son of Man coming in his kingdom.
>
> Now after six days Jesus took Peter, James and his brother John, and led them up a high mountain, and was transfigured before them.

The reader will have noticed that our logion follows immediately on Jesus' reference to the parousia. From this rationalists infer that He erred, believing that the end of the world with the last judgment would come within the generation then living.[4] Catholics, of course, reject such an interpretation. To admit it,

[4] See e.g. Th. Keim, *The History of Jesus of Nazareth,* IV, p. 286-8.

one would have to disregard totally—as eschatologists like J. Weiss and A. Schweitzer actually do—nine tenths of the Gospel and any number of Jesus' sayings in which the opposite is enunciated clearly enough.[5] But my purpose is more positive, viz., to find out if possible what this logion actually means. It certainly is a *prediction,* a solemn prediction ("Amen I say to you"), which our Lord evidently meant to stick in the minds of His hearers. Its constitutive elements are the initial phrase "some of those standing here," and the end phrase, which enunciates what they, in distinction from most of the others present, will see or witness before death. But the question before us is: What exactly did our Lord predict that these few would see?

2. GENUINITY

In defending the genuinity of the prediction, rationalists fight on the side of the angels, though from the less angelic motive of convicting our Lord of error. But we really do not need their support. There is no reason whatever for denying that the three passages quoted were part of the original Gospels. Nor is there any indication that they had originally another place in the single Gospels, and that they somehow slipped into the places where we find them now.

Also the Greek text is fairly uniform. The initial phrase varies slightly in our manuscripts,[6] but as its meaning is undoubtedly the same in all three Gospels, these variations may be dismissed as irrelevant for our purpose. In Mark the end phrase is guaranteed by all witnesses of the text, but there are variations in the other two Gospels. In Matthew some manuscripts read "coming in the glory of His Father," while Luke has the variant reading "till they have seen the Son of Man coming in His glory."[7] However, these variations are not sufficiently supported to create a serious doubt about the original reading, and they easily betray themselves as harmonizations or rather glosses whose purpose was to bring the prediction in line with the preceding verse, where the Son of Man is promised as coming in glory.

[5] L. de Grandmaison, *Jesus Christ,* III, p. 91-2.
[6] Cf. Mark, *in locos;* Lagrange, *Comm. on Mark* (5th ed.), p. 226.
[7] Cf. Merk and Nestle, *in locos.*

3. Historicity

From the less exalted motive indicated, rationalists also defend the historical character of our logion. Nevertheless we shall do well to examine this point independently of their assent or dissent, especially since it really involves four distinct questions.

1. Is there any reason for suspecting that this saying of Jesus, though part of the Gospels, is *unhistorical?* Could it be a fiction on the part of the evangelists or of the early community, who put it in the mouth of Jesus to explain perhaps some disturbing fact, as, e.g., the delay of the parousia? No, such an assumption would not only be against inspiration, but also gratuitous. We have the positive testimony of three first-class witnesses, more or less independent, that our Lord Himself made this solemn prediction; for, as we saw, it is attributed to Him by all three Synoptics.

2. But is the *setting* historical? We need not discuss the view of L. K. Schmidt[8] that the exhortation as a whole (Mt. 16:24-28; Mk. 8:34–9:1; Lk. 9:23-27) is unhistorical, that the single sayings joined in it were all uttered on other occasions, but united into one discourse by Mark, from whom the other Synoptics copied it. Though not directly against inspiration, this opinion lacks all proof.

A. Schweitzer[9] claims that Mk. 8:34–9:29 is wholly out of place, that the events narrated there happened elsewhere and long before the confession of Peter. As a result he can say that the special revelation granted to Peter (Mt. 16:17) was nothing else than the Transfiguration. I mention this merely as an exegetical curiosity; no one, as far as I know, has adopted Schweitzer's view, and it does not enter vitally into our discussion.

But restricting the discussion to our prophecy, one may ask: did our Lord utter it only once and on that definite occasion at which the context hints? Or did He perhaps make it several times in more or less the same words? The first alternative is usually taken for granted. But the other is not impossible. It has the great advantage that it would account for the differences in the end phrase. Still, the fact that all three Synoptics place the prophecy in the same context, makes the first alternative

[8] *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu*, p. 220-1.
[9] *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, 4th ed., 1926, p. 430.

much more likely, and the verbal differences in the end phrase can be explained on editorial grounds.

3. But the question of the historical setting may be pushed further.

What precedes the prophecy is evidently an exhortation to self-denial and a promise of its reward when the Son of Man shall return in glory. But one may ask: Was our logion a part or rather the *conclusion* of that exhortation, as one might gather from its present place? Or was it originally uttered on another occasion, but inserted here by the evangelists (or tradition) because it fitted the context? Our Lord certainly preached the doctrine of self-denial at different times and in almost identical words.[10] On one or the other of these occasions He might also have added something akin to our logion, if there were some logical or psychological or verbal connection.

Lagrange and Prat favor the latter hypothesis. Lagrange thus accounts for the origin of the three formulas and their differences. Though not part of the preceding exhortation, the prophecy was first attached to it by Mark. However, to prevent any misunderstanding in the eschatological sense, he indicated the break in the context by a special introductory phrase, "And he said to them." This device was meant to warn the readers not to make too close a connection between the prophecy and the preceding reference to the parousia. Mark's device was, however, more or less neglected by Matthew and Luke, and the break became even less discernible when the Greek translator of Mt. introduced the "Son of Man" to establish a verbal harmony with the preceding verse.[11]

Of course, if this theory could be proved, it would cut the ground from under the rationalists; for since the saying itself is not clearly eschatological, it receives an eschatological slant mostly from its proximity to the preceding verse. In that case, the evangelists might be blamed at most for a *suggestio falsi*, as was done by one of whom van Steenkiste tells us. A "vir doctus, vinculis amicitiae mihi coniunctissimus," he says, surmised that the proximity was wholly due to Matthew, who thought "opinione privata" that the destruction of Jerusalem and the last judgment would coincide, and who therefore placed the predic-

[10] Cf. Mt. 10:38-9; Lk. 14:25-7; 17:33; Jn. 12:25.

[11] Lagrange, *Evangile selon Saint Marc*, 5th ed., 1929, p. 227.

tion so that the reader would draw such an inference. Van Steenkiste rightly rejects this opinion as contrary to inspiration.[12]

The most probable answer is that the prediction was *part of the exhortation,* if not its *conclusion,* but that there was yet a certain *break* in the delivery. The hypothesis that the prediction was not originally part of the preceding exhortation, remains without proof and is held by very few. On the other hand, if there had been no break, why did Mark indicate one by the words, "And he said to them"? St. Gregory points out another reason for supposing a break. The logion says nothing of the "personal glory" of the Son of Man, such as would have been necessary to carry the thought forward from the preceding verse. This was felt by those who, in Mt. and Lk., introduced variant readings in the end phrase; they wished to remedy a seeming lack of sequence of thought.

It is, indeed, quite possible that the actual discourse was much longer, and that the evangelists (or tradition) *summarized* it, picking from it the few sentences now incorporated in our Gospels as the gist of the exhortation. As it stands, the discourse takes barely half a minute to read. Is it likely that our Lord devoted no more time to a fundamental teaching of His, one, moreover, which He saw had not yet been grasped by the Apostles, not even by Peter, on whom He had just promised to build His Church?

4. The question of the historical setting may have yet another meaning: *To whom* was the exhortation addressed? And consequently, *who* were "those standing here"? According to Matthew (16:24), they were οἱ μαθηταί, seemingly the Apostles; Mark (8:34) has the same plus a crowd (ὁ ὄχλος); Luke (9:23) has "But he said to all."

The answer seems immaterial for our main purpose. Those present might have been many or comparatively few (like the 12 Apostles alone); the ultimate meaning of the prediction does not depend on the size of the audience. But the question becomes unanswerable if one supposes (with Prat and Lagrange) that the prediction did not originally form part of the preceding exhortation. For in that case, all we have to go by is Mark's vague introduction, "And he said to them."

[12] J. A. van Steenkiste, *Ev. sec. Matthaeum.*, ed. 3a, 1881, p. 656; J. Knabenbauer, *Ev. sec. Marcum,* p. 230.

4. EXEGESIS

Our main concern is, of course, the meaning of the prediction. Our Lord certainly spoke of a future event, which was to come to pass within the lifetime of "some" of those surrounding Him on that occasion. For commentators agree that the unusual phrase "they will not taste death" means simply "they will not die." On the other hand, the form in which the prediction is cast, implies that many or most of His audience would have died by then.

Therefore, the predicition must already be fulfilled; for all those who listened to our Lord then, are now dead. But *what was the event predicted?*

Exegetes have named *five events:* a) the Transfiguration, b) the Resurrection and Ascension, c) Pentecost, d) the destruction of Jerusalem, e) the last judgment. Some combine the last two and claim that our Lord referred to the destruction of Jerusalem, but as a type of the last judgment.

Let us weigh the single opinions, first in the light of the initial phrase, and then of the end phrase.

(1). *The Initial Phrase*

a. By far the most common opinion among the Fathers and earlier theologians was that our Lord here referred to the Transfiguration. What influenced them in this exegesis was, no doubt, the fact that the account of the Transfiguration follows immediately the prediction, that the Son of Man there appeared in heavenly glory, and that only three of the Apostles witnessed it. This is the interpretation given by St. Basil, St. Cyril of Alexandria, St. Ephrem, St. Jerome, St. Hilary, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, St. Leo the Great, Euthymios Zigabenos, Maldonatus, Jensenius, Syveira, Cornelius a Lapide, etc.

Certainly an imposing array. Have we, then, here an instance of the consent of the Fathers and theologians, which binds the Catholic interpreter of Scripture? It does not seem so. None of them proposes his explanation as a matter of faith. Even Fr. Bover, who regards the authority of the Fathers as decisive in this question, grants some probability to two other opinions.[13] Indeed, if this interpretation were a matter of faith clearly taught by the Fathers, how is it that St. Gregory the Great, the last of the Latin Fathers, departed from it? And how could the

[13] *Verbum Domini*, 1939, p. 36-7.

Church allow so many modern exegetes to adopt different interpretations?

Still, the authority of the Fathers and theologians gives to the first opinion a high degree of extrinsic probability. We agree perfectly with what Fr. Bover says: "Profecto, nisi gravissima ratio urget... tot tantorumque Patrum non est deserenda auctoritas." We should certainly abide by it if there were not strong *internal reasons* against it. But it seems irreconcilable with the initial phrase. Whatever be the exact meaning of the end phrase, *only a week* elapsed between the prediction and the Transfiguration. Does it not sound ridiculous (I am quoting Fr. Knabenbauer) to anounce solemnly that some of those standing here will not die till the week is out?[14]

It is mainly on the strength of such reasoning that modern exegetes have generally abandoned the interpretation of the Fathers. But Fr. Lagrange exaggerates somewhat when he says that it is held by no one today; Fr. Cladder proposes it without further discussion; so does Fr. Bover, though with discussion, and he can quote for it Lebreton and Willam.

b. The same argument also militates against the second and the third opinion. Though we are not sure how much time separated the exhortation from the *Resurrection* and from Pentecost, yet, to all appearances, it was too short to warrant the initial phrase. The Resurrection and Pentecost may have been only *a few months* away, perhaps only a few weeks. Was there any likelihood that many or most of our Lord's hearers would die in the interim? And if not, how could He speak as He did?

c. If the initial phrase is allowed its full force, the most likely event referred to is the *destruction of Jerusalem.* When the prediction was made, that tragedy was still some 40 years away; when it did come to pass, many, perhaps most of those who heard Jesus' exhortation were dead. It is no wonder then that this interpretation is quite common among modern exegetes. It is held by Marana, Allioli, Bisping, Schegg, van Steenkiste, Maas, Fillion, Prat, Miller, etc.

Fr. Bover objects against it that only one of the Apostles, St. John, was alive at the tragic event, and that this fact could not

[14] Fr. Bover's answer to this argument is rather unconvincing. He sees a marked difference between "there are some of those standing here" and "some who stand here."

be made to square with our Lord's "some." But first of all, we know next to nothing about the time when many of the Apostles died. Secondly, as we saw, it is not sure that only the twelve Apostles were present at the exhortation; Mark at least mentions a crowd besides them.

But there is a real drawback to this opinion. While the Fathers relied on a forced connection between the prediction and the episode of the Transfiguration related immediately after it, this recent opinion overstresses the proximity of the prediction to what precedes. Since Jesus there spoke of a *judgment,* the inference is drawn that our logion, being a continuation of thought, must refer to another judgment, such as was visited upon the Jews in the destruction of their holy city. But such an inference does not sufficiently take into account the break by which Mark separates our logion from the preceding verse.

However, we shall return to this opinion later.

d. Though our Lord spoke of the *last judgment,* the parousia, in the sentence immediately preceding, very few exegetes think that that was in His mind when He made the prediction. Two weighty reasons militate against this view: the initial phrase, which would become wholly nugatory, and the break in the context indicated by Mark.

But might not the last judgment be referred to *typically?* That depends on whether the prediction refers literally to another judgment, such as the destruction of Jerusalem. For the typical sense always rests on the literal and proceeds from it, as St. Thomas teaches. To answer this question, therefore, we must consider the end phrase.

(2). *The End Phrase*

As is clear from the three texts quoted in the beginning of this article, there is no verbal agreement among the Synoptics as to what the few survivors of Jesus' audience will see. But do they also disagree really?

a. If I understand Fr. Knabenbauer[15] right, he seems to say that the meaning of the end phrase is not the same in all three Synoptics. According to him, *Matthew* differs from the other

[15] *Ev. sec. Marcum,* p. 230; *Ev. sec. Lucam,* p. 317.

two and must be interpreted as referring to an impending judgment, which can only be the destruction of Jerusalem.

This view does not seem probable. Since the logion was uttered only once in a definite context, which is the same in all three synoptics, our Lord must have had in mind one definite event. Moreover, since also the initial phrase is the same in all, it seems odd to surmise that the end phrase has not the same meaning.

b. But supposing that the meaning is really the same, the further question arises: Which of the three formulas is the original or comes closest to the original? Or which expresses Jesus' idea best?

Now Luke's formula "seeing the kingdom of God" is too vague to convey anything very definite. Dausch thinks that Matthew's formula, "the Son of Man coming in his kingdom," is more Semitic and therefore closer to the original; but Joüon denies this, at least as far as the verb "coming" goes. Fr. Bover also prefers Matthew's formula, because it points to the Transfiguration as the event in our Lord's mind; but after what has been said, that would rather lessen its value.

Everything considered, Mark's formula, "the kingdom of God having come in power" seems to come closest to the original. Let us grant that it is not as unequivocal as one might wish it. But if we insist on making it more definite, we may be putting our own interpretation on Jesus' words. He may not have referred to a definite historical event, that is, one which happened in a definite year and in a definite place. He may well have meant, as St. Gregory the Great and Ven. Bede surmised, a long drawn-out fact, one of which people did not become really conscious until near the end of it, or until a milestone was reached in the development. Such in the mind of modern exegetes[16] was the *marvelous spread of the Church.*

The best proof for this interpretation is that it fits in perfectly with the *context.* Not in the sense that the logion continues the idea of the last judgment and of the personal glory of the Son of Man contained in the preceding verse, but in the sense that it marks a *fitting conclusion* for the whole exhortation. Since the

[16] Knabenbauer for Mk. and Lk., Le Camus, Lagrange, Dean, Card. Gomá, Lusseau-Collomb, Hartdegen, etc.

Master had proposed to the disciples a program of life which was anything but pleasant for human nature, He would not leave them without some comforting assurance. He softened the prospect of hard days ahead by pointing to a glorious future not too far distant. We might call this human comfort, but it was needed by the Apostles. Theirs it would be to preach Jesus' gospel of self-denial and renunciation. A hard doctrine and one not easy to grasp. They may well have wondered how it would ever gain a foothold in a self-indulgent world, how it would ever succeed against the unreasoning yet imperious demands of human nature. Our Lord assured them beforehand that it would prevail against all odds. Some of them at least would see the day when the divine energy inherent in the Gospel and in the Church would be manifest to all, when it would be evident that the kingdom of God had indeed come in power.[17]

This indeed seems to be the meaning of Mark's formula. True, he uses the more or less vague term "kingdom of God"; but this is made more definite by Matthew's formula, where "His kingdom" can be no other than the Church of Christ. But what the few survivors of the prophecy will see, is evidently the marvelous expansive power of the Church, which characterized it from the beginning, but did not strifle the eye as it did some 20 or 30 years later, when the Church had, against all expectations, spread over the face of the earth.

With this interpretation almost all other opinions can be harmonized. The Transfiguration, the Resurrection and Ascension, Pentecost—what else were they than the beginning of that miraculous diffusion of Christ's kingdom, primarily in the hearts of the Apostles, but a prelude to its world-wide diffusion.[18] Fr. Lagrange thinks that even the destruction of Jerusalem might be joined up with it. Not as a judgment on Israel, but as a particular crisis which severed the Church definitely from its original bond with one people, and launched it forth as a Church universal.

[17] In the Introduction to his commentary on Mark (p. cxliv) Lagrange says: "Rien de plus clair d'après le contexte." But his further explanation there differs from the one here proposed, because he has in view the *remote* context.

[18] Cf. Lusseau-Collomb, IV, p. 578.

Conclusion

We have not the testimony of any of those present at the exhortation that this prophecy was fulfilled. But we have the testimony of two conemporaries, both of whom did much to make it come true. One is Luke, whose purpose in writing the Acts of Apostles was to show forth the energetic working of the Holy Spirit in the miraculous expansion of the Church. The other is Paul. Some 30 years after the prophecy, he could not only testify that the Gospel had already been preached to the ends of the world (Rom. 10:18), but also that it was "the power of God unto salvation" (Rom. 1:16), "the power of the Holy Spirit" everywhere (Rom. 15:19), a "demonstration of the Spirit and of power" (1 Cor. 2:5, 4:20). The seed which the Apostles had been commissioned to sow in a seemingly hopeless field, evidently had in it a divine energy which nothing could resist—neither the world nor the flesh nor the devil.

Weston College
Weston, Massachusetts

ST. AUGUSTINE'S DEFENSE OF THE HEXAEMERON

Rev. John P. Maher, O.S.A., S.T.L.

II

1 Defense of the Work of the First Day

Saint Augustine in carrying on his investigations concerning the origin of nature chose the Old and the New Testament as his principal means of guidance. The Manicheans, however, not only refused to accept the Old Testament, but even went so far as to censure it.[1] Faustus declared that he did not accept it because he was prevented from doing so by the New; against him, Augustine proved that Christians uphold the authority of the Ancient Covenant not in "imitation of the subservience of the Jews but in attestation of Christian liberty."[2] More particularly, the Tagastan explained away the contradictions which Adimantus believed he found to exist between the Old Testament and the New; indeed, in the early chapters of the book which he wrote against this disciple of Manes, Augustine specifically defended the Mosaic text.[3]

The text of the Mosaic narration which Augustine used in writing his books *De Genesi contra manichaeos,* is substantially the same as the text cited by him in his other writings.[4] The method he employed in laying the corner stone of his defense against the Manichean phantasies, was that of allegorical interpretation.[5] In this he used the same type of exegesis characteristic of the style of St. Ambrose in the writings of the latter, e.g., *Hexaemeron, De Noe et arca,* etc. These writings were, for the most part, a compilation of sermons which the Bishop of Milan preached to the faithful. Prescinding from an interpretation of the text according to its literal significance, Ambrose adapted himself to his hearers and readers, making use of a type of exegesis altogether allegorical, and similar in many respects to the method found in the works of Origen and of Philo. History testifies to the powerful influence of Ambrose on Augustine. In fact, the preaching of the eloquent Bishop of Milan occasioned

[1] *De Gen. contra man.*, 1, 1; MPL 34, 173.

[2] *Contra Faustum* 8, 1; MPL 42, 240.

[3] *Contra Adimantum* 1; MPL 42, 129.

[4] Cf. J. S. McIntosh, *A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis* (Chicago, 1912), pp. 13 ff.

[5] *Retract.* I, 18: MPL 32, 613.

the conversion of the sorely perplexed Tagastan. It is only natural then, that the neo-convert should adopt some of the methods of the man towards whom he held a feeling of profound respect. One of the characteristics of the master Ambrose which the disciple Augustine seemed to make his own, was this use of the allegorical interpretation of Holy Writ. He adopted this method because, at that early state of his conversion, he felt himself too incapable of fighting a winning battle against his adversaries, were he to attempt a literal interpretation of the Sacred Text.[6] He used it not only because he lacked a better, but also because he felt that it was more adapted to the imaginative temperament of the Manicheans.

Having prefaced this, we shall now take up for examination the individual verses of the first chapter of Genesis, explaining at the same time the reasoning of Augustine on these passages as found in his *De Genesi contra manichaeos*. We shall give a criticism of the version of the Mosaic text as found in this work, comparing it with parallel citations as found in other works of the holy Doctor.

The work of the first day is related in verses 1-5. Gen. 1:1: "In the beginning God made heaven and earth."[7]

When the Manicheans speak of God, the question should be raised as to the "God" to whom they wish to refer, for they profess to twelve great gods.[8] In the majority of cases, however, when they speak of God, they contrast the Ruler of the Realm of Light with the Plenipotentiary of the Kingdom of Darkness, calling the former the good God, the latter, the evil. Although they do not accept Genesis, and even go so far as to blaspheme against it, nevertheless they profess that the good God made the whole world which is signified by the terms "heaven and earth." This profession, however, they qualify, by adding that he made the universe out of a foreign nature and substance,[9] meaning by this that He made it out of a pre-existing matter, i.e., a matter pre-existent to the world and co-eternal with Him.

[6] Cf. G. Ricciotti, "S. Agostino come interprete del Genesi," *Didaskaleion* III, 1931, p. 25ff.

[7] "In principio fecit Deus caelum et terram." (*De Gen. contra man.* I, 2; MPL 34, 174). This verse is cited in the works of Augustine frequently and without variant.

[8] *Contra Faustum*, 15, 5; MPL 32, 613.

[9] *Contra adversarium Legis et Prophetarum* I, I; MPL 42, 603.

In the beginning God made heaven and earth. "In what beginning?" ask the Manicheans.[10] Augustine answers that God[11] made heaven and earth not in the beginning of time, but in Christ when the Word was with the Father, through whom (the Word) and in whom all things were made.[12] Christ, the Word, the Son of God, has been called "the power of God" and "the wisdom of God."[13] The term "power" conveys a certain notion of operation, of industry; the term "wisdom," a definite notion of instruction, of discipline. And both these notions are expressed in the Gospel: His power and operation, when it is said: "All things were made by Him";[14] His instruction and teaching, when later it is said:[15] "In Him was life, and the life was the light of the world."[16] This notion of Christ as the Word in whom all things were made is, moreover, confirmed by the fact that when the Jews asked our Lord who He was, He replied: "The *beginning* who also speak unto you."[17]

If God made heaven and earth in a certain beginning of time, the Manicheans wish to know what He was doing before He made heaven and earth, and why it should suddenly please Him to do that which He had never done before through "times eternal." In answer, Augustine replies that, even though we believe that God made heaven and earth in the beginning of time, we must understand that before this beginning of time, there was no time. God made the times, all of them, and before He made them they did not exist; and, therefore, there cannot be a time when God had not yet done anything. Time came into being when heaven and earth came into being, wherefore there is no time in which God had not yet made heaven and earth—in other words, time came into being simultaneously with heaven and earth. And God, the Maker of times, exists before all of them; indeed, the Apostle Paul speaks of the "full knowledge of the truth which is according to the piety of God in the hope of life everlasting

[10] *De Gen. contra man., loc cit.*

[11] "God" here is taken for the Holy Trinity, i.e., the Triune God. Cf. *Contra Adimantum* I; MPL 42, 129.

[12] John 1:1 and 3.

[13] 1 Cor. 1:24.

[14] John 1:3.

[15] *Ibid.* 1:4.

[16] *De moribus Ecclesiae catholicae et de moribus manichaeorum* I, 16; MPL 32, 1322.

[17] John 8:25.

which God, who does not lie, promised before times eternal."[18] The Manicheans accept St. Paul; so Augustine challenges them to explain the phrase "times eternal." They cannot. Augustine calls those times "eternal" which precede the creation of the world and the angels, but which are not co-eternal with God.[19] These cannot be called "secular times" (*tempora saecularia*) because the "secular" is that which passes quickly. The world is not said to be co-eval with God,—neither, accordingly, are times eternal in the same sense in which God is eternal; the maker is before the thing made, and God is the Maker of times.

In the second part of their question, the Manicheans insolently inquire into the divine will, when, as a matter of fact, they should first learn the force of the human will. They wish to know why it pleased God to make heaven and earth; they seek, then, to know the causes of the will of God. It behooves them, rather, to realize that His will is the cause of all things that exist. If the will of God were to have a cause, then there would be something antecedent to the will of God.

God made the whole world because He so wished. His will is the cause of heaven and earth, and in consequence it is greater than these.[20] In seeking to know why it pleased Him to make heaven and earth, the Manicheans seek after something greater than His will. All things whatsoever He made, He made from nothing. He *made* them, He did not generate them; the Father generates His Son. They are not equal one to another, nor are they equal to Him by whom they were made; neither are they equal to His Son through whom they were made. In the beginning therefore, i.e., in the Word, His Son, God made the whole world; and He made it from nothing.[21]

Verse 2: "The earth, however, was invisible and unformed, and darkness was over the abyss, and the Spirit of God was borne above the water."[22]

[18] "Agnitionem veritatis quae est secundum pietatem Dei in spem vitae aeternae, quam promisit non mendax Deus ante tempora aeterna" (Tit. 1:1,2).

[19] Cornelius a Lapide, *Comm. in Ep. ad Titum*, (Lugduni; 1839), IX, 847; cf. *De civ. Dei*, 12, 16; MPL 41, 365.

[20] Cf. *De Gen. contra manichaeos*, I, 2; MPL 34, 175.

[21] *Loc. cit.*

[22] "Terra autem erat invisibilis et incomposita, et tenebrae erant super abyssum, et Spiritus Dei superferebatur super aquam" (*De Gen. contra man.* 1, 3; MPL 34, 176). In *De Gen. ad litt.*, I, 1 (MPL 34, 247) the

To the Manicheans, this verse seems to contradict the first verse. How, they demand, could God have made heaven and earth in the beginning if, as stated here, the earth was invisible and unformed?

In answer, Augustine points out the harmony between these two verses. Before God endowed all things with their proper forms, establishing each in its proper place and setting through a wonderfully well-ordered work of distinction, i.e., before He said: "Let light be made," "Let the firmament be made," "Let the waters be gathered together," "Let the dry land appear," etc., the earth, which He made in the beginning, was invisible and unformed. This altogether unformed and unqualified matter is called *hylen* (stuff) out of which are formed those qualities which we perceive through the senses.[23] God created this unformed mass, produced it from nothing. Essentially, it is capable of receiving forms, for, were it not capable of receiving some certain form imposed on it by its artificer, it could not even be called matter. Only God can create and form bodies. Nor would these be created unless there existed with them their peculiar manner of being, their specific nature, and their order. As these can be only from God, the Manicheans, in consequence, set up a second god when they call *hylen* a maker of bodies.

"And darkness was over the abyss." Therefore, continue the adversaries of Augustine, was God in darkness before He made the light? They recognize no light save that which they can see with the eyes of the body. And they worship the sun as a particle of that light in which God dwells. But Augustine understands in a different way the light in which God dwells, from whom proceeds that Light which illuminates the hearts of those who believe in Him. The light of the sun illuminates the body of man and his mortal eyes, but not the whole man. The Light of which the Evangelist John writes,[24] converts the hearts of men from the love of earthly things to the fulfillment of the di-

---

word "autem" is omitted. The first part of this versicle is often quoted without variant. *De Gen ad lit. lib. imp.* 4 (MPL 34, 224) has *farebatur;* the same is true of *Sermo* 226 (MPL 38, 1099) and *Quaest. in Hept.* 1, 134 (MPL 34, 584). *Ibid.* 2, 55 (MPL 34, 615); *Contra Faustum* 22, 11 (MPL 42, 405) and *Confess.* 13, 4 (MPL 32, 846) have the plural *aquas.* (Cf. J. S. McIntosh, *A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis,* p. 43).

[23] *De natura boni,* 18: MPL 42, 556.

[24] John 1:9.

vine precepts. Before God said: "Let light be made," darkness was over the abyss. Where there is no light, there is darkness, for darkness is the absence of light. God is "the Father of lights, with whom there is no change, nor shadow of alteration."[25]

The Manicheans persist. Before God made the light, whence, they ask, was that darkness which was over the abyss? Who made it or generated it? If not made or generated, it must be eternal. From their questions, it can be seen that for them darkness is something positive. They believe that there exists a region (nation) of darkness in which dwell bodies and souls and forms. And the forces of this kingdom of darkness battle eternally against the light of God.

Augustine demonstrates the absurdity of such tenets. Darkness is experienced only when we do not see, just as silence is experienced only when we do not hear. Just as silence is nothing, so also is darkness nothing.[26] Darkness is the absence of light, just as silence is the absence of sound, and nudity is the absence of covering, etc. To imagine a nation of darkness battling against the light of God is just as foolish as to fancy a nation of silences battling against the voice of God.

"And the Spirit of God was borne above the water." This part of the versicle the Manicheans attack, demanding its meaning. Was the water the dwelling place of the Spirit of God? Did it contain this Spirit? They wish to interpret the verse in the sense that the Spirit of God was borne locally over the water as if He were being carried through space.

Augustine defends the verse and gives to it an altogether different interpretation. He draws examples from everyday life. A common expression of the day was that the sun was borne above the earth. By no means is this expression understood in the sense that the sun dwells in the earth or that the earth contains the sun. Likewise the will of a handicraftsman is carried over into the products of his handicraft. Analogously, the Spirit of God is borne over the water in a certain effective and workman-like force for the purpose of completing and forming that over which He exerts His influence.[27] "Since, therefore, it is

[25] James 1:17; cf. *Sermo* 23, c. 15; MPL 38, 161.
[26] Cf. *Contra epist. Man.* 31; MPL 42, 197.
[27] Cf. *De Gen. ad lit. lib. imp.*, 4; MPL 34, 226.

necessary that the Spirit of God be introduced in such a manner as to be said to be borne (or to hover) over (anything), it is more fitting that first there should be introduced something already begun, over which (the Spirit) is said to hover; (hover) indeed, not locally, but rather, surpassing and excelling all things through His power."[28]

The Manicheans insultingly remark: In the foregoing, it is not written that God made the water. Whence, therefore, came this water, over which the Spirit of God was hovering?

In response, Augustine points out that the water which is mentioned here is not to be understood as the water which we are now able to see and touch; and the same must be said of the earth. It is true, the first verse states that: "In the beginning, God made heaven and earth," the term "heaven and earth" signifying the universe which God created. It is because of our frailty, that names of visible things are here employed, since we are rather inept in comprehending the invisible. What was made first, however, was that confused and unformed mass out of which were to be deduced all things which have been separated and formed. God made all things from this matter, and this matter He made from nothing; accordingly, God made all things from nothing. Every finite artisan stands in need of material upon which to exercise his art: the carpenter needs wood, the silversmith needs silver, etc. Lacking this material, the artisan can do nothing, for he cannot make it. God, however, is all powerful, and in order to effect whatever He wishes, He stands in no need of aid from anything which He has not made.

That unformed matter which God made from nothing is designated by various names. In the first verse, we read: "In the beginning God made heaven and earth." There the unformed matter is called "heaven and earth" not because it was already that, but because it was able to be such. In a confused way, it was the material, as it were, the seed of heaven and earth.

A certain analogy can be drawn from the seed of a tree. We say, for example, that in this seed are the wood, the roots, the fruit, and the leaves,—not because these are already there, but because they are to come from the seed.

[28] "Cum ergo sic oporteret insinuari Spiritum Dei, ut superferri diceretur, commodius factum est ut prius insinuaretur aliquid inchoatum, cui superferri diceretur; non enim loco, sed omnia superante ac praecellente potentia." *De Gen. ad lit.* 1, 7; MPL 34, 251.

Here Augustine alludes to his doctrine of the seminal reasons which he treats of more explicitly elsewhere.[29] The question may be asked: What was the motive impelling him to introduce this doctrine? Was the reason philosophical, or theological, or was it a matter of exegesis? Was it philosophical in the sense that creation could not be explained except through recourse to this doctrine? We think not. Was it theological in the sense that it was a means used by Augustine to explain the doctrine of the transmission of original sin? It could be, but we are inclined to believe that this was not the prime motivating cause. Rather, we are inclined to believe that Augustine introduced this doctrine for exegetical reasons.[30] In his exegesis of scriptural texts dealing with creation, he often[31] cites, in conformance with our Vulgate, the text: "He that liveth for ever, created all things together."[32] To this word "together" (*simul*) he attributes the temporal significance of "simultaneously"; whereas the Greek clause employs a quantitative expression, ἔκτισε τὰ πάντα κοινῇ, to wit: "(He) created all things without exception." In this expression, the word κοινῇ modifies the word πάντα in a sense certainly quantitative, and has the significance of "absolutely, without exception." It is charged that Augustine knew very little Greek. In the sense that he was not so proficient in the use of the language as was Jerome, the charge might stand. But it is not true that he had no command whatsoever of the language. He often acknowledges in the *Retractations* that here and there he gave an inexact interpretation to some passage in the Bible, but he also states in the same work that he was led into error through the use of incorrect codices.[33] Having interpreted the word "simul" in a temporal sense, he was impelled, it seems to us, to introduce his doctrine of the seminal reasons in order to preserve the harmony between Ecclesiasticus and the Mosaic narrative. Strictly speaking, however, this doctrine does not

[29] Cf. *De Gen. ad lit.* 4, 33 et sqq.; MPL 34, 318.

[30] Ricciotti, *op. cit.*, p. 38; Boyer, *Essais sur la doctrine de saint Augustin*, chapitre 4: "La théorie augustinienne des raisons séminales," (Paris 1932) pp. 97-137; vide *Miscellanea Agostiniana*, II, 795-819.

[31] Cf. *De Gen. ad lit.*, 6, 3; MPL 34, 340; 10, 2; MPL 34, 409; 4, 33; MPL 34, 318; 4, 34: MPL 34, 319; 5, 3; MPL 34, 323.

[32] Eccli. 18:1: "Qui vivit in aeternum, creavit omnia *simul*."
Ὁ ζῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἔκτισε τὰ πάντα κοινῇ.

[33] *Retract.* 1, 10; MPL 32, 600; *ibid.* 2, 24; MPL 32, 640.

enter into the question of his defense of the Hexaemeron against the Manicheans, since it presupposes the fact of creation and endeavors to explain the manner. Consequently, it would be useless to argue about the latter with the Manicheans, who deny the former. He refers only indirectly to his doctrine of the seminal reasons here where he treats of the various names used in designating the unformed matter.

This unformed matter is also called the invisible and unformed earth, because among all the elements of the world, the earth seems to be less beautiful than the rest. It is called invisible because of its obscurity, unformed because of its lack of shape. Then again, this same matter is named water because all things that are on the earth whether they be animals, or tree, or plants, or such like, begin to be formed and nourished from a fluid (humid substance).

The purpose of using these various names to designate one and the same matter is to make known, by the use of many words, something hitherto unknown to the inexperienced; thus avoiding, by the use of a variety of terms, presumption on the part of those who might otherwise think that this material could adequately be designated by one word alone.

To recapitulate, this unformed matter is called "heaven and earth" because these are to come from it! it is named the "invisible and unformed earth," and "darkness over the abyss," because it lacked shape and could be seen or touched under no species, even were man present to see or touch it; it is said to be water because it lent itself easily and tractably to the power of the Maker that all things might be formed from it. But under all these designations, this mass, out of which God formed the world, was unseen and shapeless.

Gen. 1:3: "And God said: 'Let light be made.' And light was made."[34]

The Manicheans find no fault with this versicle; on the contrary, they admit that light has God for its author.

[34] "Et dixit Deus: Fiat lux. Et facta est lux" (*De Gen. contra man.* 1, 8; MPL 34, 179). In his writings, Augustine often quotes this verse and always in almost the same way. In *De Gen. ad lit.* I, 17 (MPL 34, 258), the first "Et" is omitted because of the context in which the verse is cited.

Verse 4: "And God saw the light, that it was good; and God made a division between light and darkness."[35]

The logical conclusion to be drawn from this verse, say the Manicheans, is that God either did not know what the light was or He did not know what was good.

Augustine in answering this blasphemous charge, adduces the example of a skilled woodworker. Although, in comparison with the wisdom and power of God, the human artisan is as nothing, nevertheless, with due reservations, an analogy can be struck between the infinite Creator and the finite laborer. The latter derives a certain amount of pleasure while he cuts and treats the wood, hewing it, using the adz on it, planing, turning, and polishing it, striving always for that degree of perfection which the standards of his craft demand and his individual skill will permit. And when he has completed his work and feels pleased in viewing the finished product, we do not say that this sense of pleasure convicts him of previously having been ignorant of the good. Indeed, he knew it in his mind where art really is more beautiful than it is in the products thereof. That which the artisan sees interiorly in art, he puts forth exteriorly in work, and it is this perfected work that pleases him. Keeping in mind the infinite perfections of God, and allowing for the shortcomings of man, the same can by analogy be said of Him. The meaning of the verse is not that some good, hitherto unknown to Him, suddenly beamed forth at Him, but rather that the finished product, the light, pleased Him.

Must God be said to have marveled at the light, that it was good? No. Our Lord Jesus Christ marveled at the faith of the centurion;[36] this the Manicheans read and praise, without, however, explaining it. If they cannot solve this difficulty in the Gospel which they profess to know, they should hold their peace about the Law, which they know not.

The seeming difficulty in Moses vanishes with the solution of

[35] "Et vidit Deus lucem quia bona est; et divisit Deus inter lucem et tenebras" (*De Gen. contra man.* 1, 8; MPL 34, 179), Augustine often quotes this verse. In *De Gen. ad lit.* 1, 17 (MPL 34, 259) the neuter "bonum" is substituted for the feminine "bona"; and sometimes the citation is adapted to the context, as, for example, in *Contra duas epistolas pelagianorum*, 2, 7 (MPL 44, 582), where the word "Deus" is omitted. (Cf. McIntosh, *op. cit.* p. 43).

[36] Mt. 8:10.

the apparent difficulty in Matthew, which Augustine solves thus: Admiration is born of things unexpected. Strictly speaking, there was in Christ no admiration which flowed from the depths of his heart. In us, admiration arises from the fact that we see or hear something new, unusual, and unknown.

> Christ, however, through His infused knowledge knew all things even before they were made; accordingly for Him who is omniscient, there could be nothing new, unknown or unthought of, and admirable. When, indeed, He observed something great and new, He permitted to arise within Him, through His experiential knowledge, a certain superficial internal act and an external gesture of admiration in order to teach others to marvel at the same thing.[37]

All such motions of His are signs, not of a mind that is perturbed, but of a Master who teaches; and so they must be interpreted here, for they bespeak a condescension to our ineptitude rather than weakness on the part of God. Properly speaking, no such thing as admiration can be predicated of Him; those things which we are apt to understand are told to us that we may be educated[38] and brought to the perception of those things which no human word can express.

Continuing, Augustine links up the latter part of the fourth verse: "And God made a division between light and darkness" with the first part of the following verse. The entire fifth verse reads as follows: "And God called the light day, and the darkness he called night: and there was made evening,[39] and there was made morning, one day."[40]

[37] Thus is St. Augustine interpreted on this point by Corn. a Lap., "Comm. in Matthaeum" 8:10, *Comm. in Scripturam Sacram*, VIII, 191.

[38] In edited works, we read: "ut nutriatur fides" (in order that (our) faith may be nourished) instead of "ut nutriamur" (in order that we may be educated). However, the oldest and best recognized Regius codex, along with ten other Mss. quotes "ut nutriamur" (cf. MPL 34, 180, note).

[39] Edited works quote the neuter form: "Et factum est vespere" rather than the feminine: "Et facta est vespera." The Mss., however, consistently quote the latter (cf. *loc. cit.*).

[40] "Et vocavit Deus diem lucem, et tenebras vocavit noctem: et facta est vespera, et factum est mane dies unus" (*De Gen. contra man.* 1, 9-10; MPL 34, 180). Except for the transposition of the words "diem" and "lucem" in *De Gen. ad lit. lib. imp.* 6 (MPL 34, 230), the first part of this verse elsewhere is quoted uniformly without variant except in two places: in *In Joannis Evangelium* 44, 4 (MPL 35, 1715) and in *Sermo* 226 (MPL 38, 1099) where we read "lucem vocavit diem." The second part of the verse is thus cited in *Contra Adimant*, 1 (MPL 42, 129): "et factum

When it is said that God made a division between the light and darkness, the meaning is not that He made the darkness, for, as has been noted in the preceding pages, darkness lacks entity and signifies only the absence of light. Here it is simply stated that a distinction was made between light and darkness, and the meaning is that darkness ensued upon the withdrawal of the light. We, indeed, distinguish between the sound of the voice and silence. In crying aloud, we produce the sound of the voice; and by making no sound, we bring about silence, for silence is the cessation of the sound of the voice. Just as we, in a certain sense, and rightly, are said to make silence, so also in many places in Holy Scripture, is God rightly said to make the darkness when, for certain times or in certain places, either He does not grant light or He withdraws it. This is said in accordance with our manner of understanding things and is nothing more than an accommodating, to our limited mental powers, of truths rather difficult to understand.

When it is said that God *called* the darkness night, the meaning is not that He used any specific language such as Hebrew, or Greek, or Latin. God is pure Intellect and with Him there is no babel of words or diversity of tongues. The term "called" has the causative force of "have made to be called" and signifies the manner in which God acted when He distinguished all things and put them in order that they might be discerned and named. Even in common expressions of the day, the same significance holds, as for example, when we say that a certain head of a family *built a house* we do not necessarily mean that he actually constructed the building himself.[41] The meaning is, rather, that he caused his house to be built. Many such expressions are found in Holy Writ.

"And there was made evening, and there was made morning, one day."

The Manicheans subtly attack this part of the verse, accusing the author of declaring therein that the day begins at evening. They do not understand that the whole operation here described pertains to the day. The activity of the day embraces the making

---

est vespere et factum est mane dies una." The same must be said for *Enarr. in Ps.* 70, 16 (MPL 36, 885) with this exception: the masculine form "dies unus" is used. (Cf. McIntosh, *op. et loc. cit.*)

[41] Cf. *De Gen. contra man.* I, 9; MPL 34, 180.

of the light, the dividing of the light and darkness, and the naming of the light, day, and the darkness, night. The operation completed, the day ended and evening fell. But the night also pertains to its proper day, since a day is not said to have passed unless, with the passing of night, the morning dawns. For Augustine, then, the term "And there was made evening" denotes the completion of the operation just described, and the term "and there was made morning" denotes the completion of the day by the addition of its integral part, night.[42] Thereafter, the remaining days are computed from morning to morning, for, with the dawning of the morning after the passing of the first day, begins the operation of the second day which (operation) continues till evening. Night complements its day, and with the dawn of morning, the second day has passed. The other days, in like manner, also pass.

2: DEFENSE OF THE WORK OF THE SECOND DAY

The work of the second day is narrated in verses 6-8. Gen. 1:6: "And God said: 'Let there be made in the midst of the water, a firmament, and let there be a division between water and water.' And so it was done.[43]

Verse 7: And God made the firmament, and God divided between the water which is above the firmament and the water which is below the firmament.[44]

[42] Cf. *De Gen. contra man.* I, 10; MPL 34, 181.

[43] "Et dixit Deus: Fiat firmamentum in medio aquae, et sit divisio inter aquam et aquam. Et sic factum est" (*De Gen. contra man.* I, 11; MPL 34, 181). In *Lib. imp.* 8 (MPL 34, 231), and in *De Gen. ad lit.* 2, 1 (MPL 34, 263) "dividens" is read instead of "divisio"; however, the latter work 2, 6 (MPL 34, 267, 268) twice has "divisio" for "dividens." Also in *De Gen. ad lit.* 2, 1 (MPL 34, 263) "in medio aquarum" is read instead of "in medio aquae." (Cf. McIntosh, *op. et loc. cit.*)

[44] "Et fecit Deus firmamentum, et divisit Deus inter aquam quae est super firmamentum, et inter aquam quae est sub firmamento" (*De Gen. contra man.* 1, 11; MPL 34, 181). *Lib. imp.* 8 (MPL 34, 232) has "erat" for "est" and transposes the order of the latter part of the verse thus: "... inter aquam quae erat sub firmamento et aquam quae erat supra firmamentum," leaving out the second "inter" and substituting "supra" for "super." *De Gen. ad lit.* 2, 6 (MPL 34, 267) has "erat" for "est," substitutes "infra" for "sub" and transposes the order to agree with *Lib. imp.* 8 (MPL 34, 232).

Verse 8: And God called the firmament heaven, and God saw that it was good. And there was made evening, and there was made morning, the second day."[45]

So far as Augustine can recall, the Manicheans do not reprehend the things related in these verses.

Because the waters were divided in order that some might exist above, and others below the firmament, and because of the fact that the unformed matter, out of which all things were to be fashioned, was called water, Augustine is inclined to believe that here the corporeal matter of visible things was separated from the incorporeal matter of invisible things by[46] the firmament of heaven. He uses the composite term "firmament of heaven"; what then does the simple term "firmament" mean to him? He tells us[47] that the firmament gets its name from the fact that the genus of corporal matter is here specified and distinguished from matter incorporeal. In divers places, he discusses the significance of the term. At one time,[48] he tells us it means the same as the heaven which was formed afterwards. In this sense it is understood as something rather changeable and dissoluble beneath the ethereal heaven, in which all things have been firmly and harmoniously fixed. He adds,[49] however, that not entirely is the firmament heaven. He speaks[50] of the high heaven (coelum sublime) and of the highest heaven (summum coelum). The former is an airy space, heavier and lower than the latter, beneath which, accordingly, it lies. This high heaven is lighter than water, yet it is not impossible to think of water's being reduced to such infinitesimal drops that it could exist as a very light vapor above this airy space.

There is a very lofty region of purer air in which no clouds gather, no tempests exist, and where there is no wind (such is said to be the state of the air on the peak of Mt. Olympus). It is not absurd to think of the "firmament of heaven" as reaching

[45] "Et vocavit Deus firmamentum caelum: et vidit Deus quia bonum est. Et facta est vespera, et factum est mane dies secundus" (*De Gen. contra man.* 1, 11; MPL 34, 181). This verse is cited without variant.

[46] Edited works have "*sub* firmamento caeli," but the MSS. do not contain the word "sub" (cf. MPL 34, 181, note).

[47] *De Gen. ad lit. lib. imp.* 8; MPL 34, 232.

[48] *Ibid.*

[49] *Ibid.*, 9.

[50] *De Gen. ad lit.* 2, 4; MPL 34, 266.

up into these spaces; nor is it absurd to believe that this very pure and tranquil air pertains to the "firmament," for tranquillity itself and many other things can be signified by the term. This very pure air extends from the summit of heaven down to the clouds, that is, down to the misty and stormy and moist air. It is included in the term "firmament," while this latter air is expressed in the term "waters."[51]

According to Augustine's belief,[52] the corporeal material of visible things was separated from the incorporeal material of invisible things by the firmament. There are bodies celestial and bodies terrestrial.[53] Among all bodies, none more beautiful exist than the celestial, and among the better celestial bodies, heaven is the most beautiful. Nevertheless, every invisible creature surpasses it in beauty, wherefore it is said that there are, perhaps, invisible waters above heaven. These, in the opinion of some, surpass this corporeal heaven, not indeed locally,[54] but by merit of the dignity of their incorporeal nature.[55] From the fact that this nature lends itself readily to formation, it appears to be a "quasi-material" and is named "water."[56] As to the question of how waters can exist above the firmament, nothing should be rashly affirmed. The question is, indeed, an obscure one and treats of something beyond the sense-perception of man. Caution and modesty are paramount in making this inquiry. A divinely wrought work is proposed for credence, and must be believed even before it be understood. Oftentimes according to the human manner of speaking, something is said to be contrary to nature when, in truth, it is only contrary to the use of nature insofar as this use is known to mortals. God, the Maker and Creator of all natures, does nothing contrary to nature; whatever He does, from whom proceeds the entire manner and number and order of nature, will be in accordance with nature.[57]

In one of his works,[58] Augustine seems to make his own that opinion which holds that the distinction between the angels and

[51] *Lib. imp.* 14; MPL 34, 238.
[52] *De Gen. contra man.* 1, 11; MPL 34, 181.
[53] *Lib. imp.* 8; MPL 34, 232.
[54] *De Gen. contra man., loc. cit.*
[55] *Lib. imp.* 8; MPL 34, 232.
[56] *Ibid.*
[57] *Contra Faustum* 26, 3; MPL 42, 480.
[58] *Confessiones* 13, 32; MPL 32, 865.

inferior creatures was effected by the firmament. However, in another work[59] he rejects this opinion and writes: "... that which I have said: 'The firmament was made between the superior spiritual and the inferior corporal waters' has been said rather inconsiderately: the question, however, is very obscure."[60]

The last part of the eighth verse: "And there was made evening..." etc., is to be understood and treated as in the foregoing, where we treated the significance of this formula.[61]

3: DEFENSE OF THE WORK OF THE THIRD DAY

The work of the third day is described in verses 9-13. Gen. 1:9: "And God said: 'Let the water, which is under heaven, be gathered together into one gathering, and let the dry (land) appear'; and thus it was done. And the water, which was under heaven, was gathered together into one gathering, and the dry (land) appeared.[62]

Verse 10: And God called the dry (land) the earth; and the gathering together of the water He called the sea. And God saw that it is good."[63]

These two verses are taken together by Augustine for a brief consideration. The Manicheans insultingly ask: "If the whole was full of waters, how could the waters be gathered together

[59] *Retract.* 2, 6; MPL 32, 632.

[60] "... quod dixi, 'Firmamentum factum inter spirituales aquas superiores et corporales inferiores,' non satis considerate dictum est: res autem in abdito est valde" (Ibid.).

[61] Cf. *Supra*, pp. 467-8.

[62] "Et dixit Deus: Congregetur aqua, quae est sub coelo, in congregationem unam, et appareat arida; et sic factum est. Et congregata est aqua, quae erat sub coelo, in congregationem unam, et apparuit arida" (*De Gen. contra man.* 1,12; MPL 34, 181). *Lib. imp.* 10 (MPL 34, 233) has the plural forms: "Congregentur aquae" and "sunt": "quae sub coelo *sunt*." In the same place the second relative clause: "... quae erat sub coelo" is omitted. *De Gen. ad lit.* 4, 22 (MPL 34, 312) has "collectionem" for "congregationem." Earlier in our book (*De Gen. contra man.* 1, 3; MPL 34, 176), we read: "congregentur aquae." *Confess.* 12, 22 (MPL 32, 838) has "congregetur aqua quae est sub firmamento." Cf. McIntosh, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

[63] "Et vocavit Deus aridam terram; et congregationem aquae vocavit mare. Et vidit Deus quia bonum est" (*De Gen. contra man.* 1, 12; MPL 34, 181). *De Gen. ad lit.* 2, 11 (MPL 34, 272) has "congregationes aquarum."

into one (place)?"[64] In answer, Augustine cites the principle which he established in the foregoing where he treated of the various names used to designate the unformed matter, namely, that the matter, over which the Spirit of God hovered and out of which God was to form all things, is named water. When now it is said that the water which is under heaven is gathered together into one, nothing other is meant than this: the unformed matter is specified by its proper form of visible water. The act of gathering together the water into one, signifies nothing other than the formation of the waters which we see and touch. Likewise, this earth which we see and touch is nothing other than that invisible and unformed earth (of which we treated above) which now has received its proper form of the visible earth.[65] The gathering together of the waters God called the sea, but by this appellation nothing is made known of the nature of the waters whether they be fresh or salty, for in the Hebrew language every gathering of waters is indiscriminately called the sea (יָם).

Gen. 1:11: "And God said: 'Let the earth cause to sprout forth the food-affording herbage, bearing seed according to its own genus and likeness, and the fruit-bearing tree, yielding fruit, whose seed may be in it according to its own likeness.' And so it was done.[66]

[64] *De Gen. contra man.* 1, 12; MPL 34, 181.

[65] It is not the intention of Augustine to contradistinguish here between "creation" and "formation" as though God first created the shapeless mass and then, after an interval of time, adapted specific forms to that mass. The terminology expresses two phases of one and the same unique act: God "concreated" the shapeless mass and the specific forms. Although creation and formation were brought about simultaneously, we cannot express them simultaneously (cf. *Contra adversarium Legis et Prophetarum,* 1, 9; MPL 42, 610).

[66] "Et dixit Deus: 'Germinet terra herbam pabuli, ferentem semen secundum suum genus et similitudinem, et lignum fructiferum faciens fructum, cuius semen sit in se secundum suam similitudinem.' Et sic est factum" (*De Gen. contra man.* 1, 13; MPL 34, 182). *Lib. imp.* 11 (MPL 34, 234) substitutes "fructuosum" for "fructiferum" in one place, but later varies, having "fructiferum," and transposing the phrase "secundum suum genus" to read "secundum genus suum." *De Gen. ad lit.* 2, 12 (MPL 34, 273) omits "suum," inserts another "secundum" before the first "similitudinem" and renders the relative clause in this manner: "cuius semen sit *in ipso secundum* similitudinem suam *super terram*"; and *ibid.* 5, 4 (MPL 34,

Verse 12: And the earth brought forth the food-affording herbage, bearing seed according to its genus, and the fruit-bearing tree, yielding fruit whose seed is in it according to its own likeness, according to its own genus upon the earth. And God saw that it is good.[67]

Verse 13: And there was made evening and there was made morning, the third day."[68]

Against the facts narrated in the above verses, the Manicheans protest: "If God commanded the food-affording herbage and the fruit-bearing tree to be born of the earth, who commanded that there should be born so many thorny and poisonous plants which serve not at all for food, and so many trees which bear no fruit?"[69] They admit that grains and vegetables and apples are good, because, as they say, in these there is some part of God. Yet they are not to be considered pantheists, since they postulate a duplex principle whence all things in the world proceed: the good from which come all good things; and the evil which accounts for all things born of carnal copulation. They grant that grains, vegetables, apples, fruits, etc., are good on account of the brightness of their color, their sweetness of taste, and the delightfulness of their fragrance. They imagine light to be God, and, accordingly, for them, everything having brightness of color is some part of God, provided it be not born of the flesh or of

---

324): "germinet terra herbam feni seminantem semen." (Cf. McIntosh, *op. et loc. cit.*)

[67] "Et ejecit terra herbam pabuli ferentem semen secundum suum genus, et lignum fructiferum faciens fructum, cuius semen est in se secundum suam similitudinem, secundum suum genus super terram. Et vidit Deus quia bonum est" (*De Gen. contra man.* 1, 13; MPL 34, 182). *Lib. imp.* 11 (MPL 34, 234) has "dedit" instead of "ejecit," omits the phrase "secundum suum genus super terram" and the word "Et" before "Deus." *De Gen. ad lit.* 2, 12 (MPL 34, 273) reads: "Et produxit terra herbam pabuli *semen habentem* secundum suum genus et *secundum similitudinem*, et lignum fructiferum faciens fructum, cuius semen eius *in eo* sit secundum genus super terram. Et vidit Deus quia bonum est." *Ibid.* 5, 4 (MPL 34, 324) varies: "Et *produxit* terra herbam pabuli (vel herbam feni) *seminantem* semen secundum genus et secundum similitudinem et lignum fructuosum faciens fructum cuius semen *suum* in se. . . ." (cf. McIntosh, *op. et loc. cit.*).

[68] "Et facta est vespera et factum est mane, dies tertius" (*De Gen contra man.* 1, 13; MPL 34, 182). This verse is cited without variant.

[69] "Si Deus iussit nasci de terra herbam pabuli et lignum fructiferum, quis iussit nasci tantas herbas vel spinosas vel venenosas, quae ad pabulum non proficiunt, et tam multa ligna quae nullum fructum ferunt?" (*Ibid.*)

carnal copulation.[70] And because they are unable to recognize the end for which thorny and poisonous plants and unfruitful trees were created, they build up in their imagination a second and evil creative principle.

With respect to their teaching concerning the good grains, flowers, etc., Augustine demonstrates that the Manicheans contradict themselves. They praise, for example, the redness of the rose, but contemn the redness of a worm, which, found in an apple, has not been born of carnal copulation. In making a comparison between divers plants or flowers, one has to be declared prettier than a certain other, wherefore the Manicheans are forced to admit a larger part of God in the first than in the second. They profess that a larger portion of God is in blooming trees than in dried-up trunks precisely because of the brightness of color in the former. Yet, if both were to be thrown into the fire, the dried-up trunks would give off a light purer and more beautiful than do the green limbs, which give off smoke.[71] Which of the two must now be said to contain the larger portion of God? Certainly not those trees which in bloom were the more beautiful.

To the protestations of the Manicheans regarding the production of thorny and poisonous plants and barren trees, Augustine thus responds: Nowhere do we read that, before original sin, the earth produced aught else but food-affording herbage and fruit-bearing trees. After the first man had sinned God said to him:

> Cursed will be the earth for thee in all thy works; in sorrow and groaning shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life: thorns and thistles shall it bring forth to thee and thou shalt eat the food of thy field: in the sweat of thy brow shalt thou eat thy bread, till thou return to the earth out of which thou wast taken; for dust thou art and unto dust thou shalt return.[72]

The curse set upon the earth consisted in this that it should produce thorns that man might have always before his eyes the

[70] *De moribus man.* 2, 16; MPL 32, 1361 ff.

[71] *Ibid.*

[72] "Maledicta erit terra tibi in omnibus operibus tuis; in tristitia et gemitu edes ex ea omnibus diebus vitae tuae: spinas et tribulos ejiciet tibi, et edes pabulum agri tui: in sudore vultus tui edes panem tuum, donec revertaris in terram de qua sumptus es; quia terra es et in terram ibis" (Gen. 3:17-19; cf. *De Gen. contra man.* 1, 13; MPL 34, 182).

sin of the first parents as a warning to him to do good and avoid evil. The poisonous plants were created as a punishment and a trial to mortals who have lost the gift of immortality through the Fall. And the unfruitful trees were created to teach men how shameful it is to be found without the fruit of good works in the field of God, i.e., in the Church.

Augustinian College
Washington, D. C.

JOB 12:7-9 AND THE KNOWABILITY OF GOD

Rev. Antonine DeGuglielmo, O.F.M., S.S.L.

During the first session of the Franciscan Educational Conference of 1943 the writer had occasion to speak on the subject of the Bible and the knowability of God.[1] While preparing that paper, he noted that Job 12:7-9 has been generally overlooked or minimized in treatises on that question, although this passage actually contains the orthodox teaching in a nutshell. More important still, it is chronologically the first explicit statement of that doctrine in the Bible. Clearly, then, this passage deserves, in fact demands, more attention from theologians. An adequate investigation, it is hoped, will contribute to the acknowledgment of its importance.

1. Text

Biblical scholars are well aware of the fact that the text of the book of Job preserved by the LXX is notably smaller in content than the one handed down by the Massoretes and the Hebrew translated by Jerome. In the passage we are discussing, vv. 8b-9 are missing in the LXX and have been supplied from Theodotion, as we know from Origen's critical notations preserved in the Syro-Hexaplar. With most modern authors we prefer in general to retain the Massoretic Text throughout the book.[2] Our preference would appear necessary here, since the LXX obviously departs from the logical division found in the Massoretic Text and presents a text that to all appearances is mutilated. We shall therefore refrain from all conjecture aimed at restoring the hypothetically primitive text underlying the LXX, likewise from restoring the original order of the verses;[3] we shall presume that substantially the Massoretic represents the original text.

[1] "The Bible and the Knowability of God," *Franciscan Studies* N.S. 3 (1943), pp. 339-363.

[2] G. Ricciotti, *Il libro di Giobbe* (Torino—Roma: Casa Editrice Marietti, 1924), p. 47: "La grande maggioranza degli studiosi oggi non dubita più a dar la prefernza, almeno in linea generale, al testo abraico del nostro Libro contro quello della più antica delle Versioni." With specific reference to our case cf. K. Budde, *Das Buch Hiob* (Göttinger Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, II, 1; 2d ed., Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Suprecht, 1913), p. 60: "Das Fehlen in LXX is nicht Grund genug den Vers zu streichen, weil auch der unentbehrliche V. 8b dort fehlt."

[3] To preserve better the flow of ideas the present order of verses has been changed to 7,8,11,12,9,10 by P. Dhorme, O.P., *Le livre de Job* (Études Bibliques; Paris: Gabalda, 1926), p. 156.

2. CONTEXT

The relation of the verses under consideration with the immediate context is not evident at once—a fact that has led some critics to ascribe them to a different author.[4] Still it is possible with no extraordinary effort to determine their relation. These words occur in the course of Job's answer to his friend Sophar; accordingly, to understand Job's retort the better, we must examine Sophar's remarks in the preceding chapter. There he rebukes Job for having dared to speak presumptuously of divine wisdom, the profound and impenetrable wisdom of God, which is so worthy of praise. He closes his speech with an exhortation to return to God and to practise justice.[5] Studying these words of Sophar, we see in particular that he had advised Job to learn the wisdom of God from direct revelation (11:5-6). The portion of Job's answer that we are examining seems aimed directly at this remark of his friend; his words must then be contrasted in some way with this part of his friend's discourse. Furthermore, if we analyze the answer of Job in its entirety, we shall learn that his words in these verses are joined aptly in thought with 12:2-3. Certainly he continues that line of thought here. Sophar must not think that he alone possesses that knowledge of which he spoke, that it is necessary to recur to divine revelation to obtain it. Indeed Job possesses the same knowledge (v. 3), anyone possessed of sound reasoning can come to that same knowledge. Such is the theme of these three verses, as we shall now see further in their interpretation. Consequently, these verses are hardly out of place; they blend well in this answer of Job.

3. INTERPRETATION

Nimirum, in Hebrew אולם, an adversative conjunction which we may translate: *but indeed*; this conjunction is used to mark a contrast with the preceding.[6] Hence, the three verses it serves

[4] We quote, e.g., B. Duhm, *Das Buch Hiob* (Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum A.T., XVI; Freiburg i.B.: J. C. B. Mohr, 1897), p. 67, where he says of vv. 7-10 that "... von einem anderen Richter stammen und den Gedanken ausführen, dass, wie man von der Tierwelt lernen könne, in Gottes Hand das Leben allen Wesen stehe, ein Gedanke, der mit dem echten Zusammenhang nicht das Geringste zu schaffen hat."

[5] Thus M. Sales, O.P., *Il Vecchio Testamento commentato*, (La Sacra Bibbia commentata; Torino: L.I.C.E., 1926), Vol. IV, p. 283.

[6] Dhorme, *op. cit.*, 7: "La formule אולם "et cependant, mais" ... est fré-

to introduce must be in direct contrast with some thought expressed previously, either in this answer of Job or in the preceding discourse of Sophar. This friend, who had asked whether Job could hope to know God perfectly (11:7), who had bidden his comrade appeal to God, is now in turn directed to turn his attention to animated creation. He is first to query the *jumenta,* בהמות in the Hebrew, or brute animals, the type and exemplar of stupidity.[7] If we should accept בהמה in this sense alone, then, indeed, we obtain a strong argument a fortiori for man's natural knowledge of God. If the brute animal, exemplifying stupidity, can give us information concerning the godhead, it should be so much the easier for men, rational beings, to obtain a natural knowledge of God. However, from the logical division of vv. 7-8 it appears much more probable that בהמות designate merely the category of four-footed beasts of the earth, the τετράποδα, as the LXX states explicitly. We find this same four-fold division of animated nature in Gen. 1:26 also, though in a different order. *Et docebunt te*—There is no necessity to change ותרך to ותאמר לך in accordance with the LXX.[8] This emendation would not change the sense substantially: in either reading information concerning the divinity is said to proceed from the beasts of the earth. Just what the beasts will teach Sophar is taken up in v. 9, which also contains the information derived from the three categories yet to be listed. After the beasts of the earth the sacred author lists the fowls of the air as another source of information for man. The words ויגד לך take up textually the words spoken by Sophar 11:6; hence, the contrast with that section mentioned previously becomes all the clearer.[9]

Loquere terrae—the Hebrew שיח literally means *to complain* or *to muse, to meditate, to study;* poetical usage sometimes calls for the meaning *to talk.* The context obviously rules out the meaning *to complain* and certainly demands that we take the verb to mean *to speak.* Perhaps there is the connotation of study

quente dans le livre de Job, pour amener une phrase exprimant une idée en opposition avec ce qui précède."

[7] *Id., op. cit.,* p. 155.

[8] This is suggested, e.g., by Duhm, *l.c.* and Driver-Gray, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Job* (International Critical Commentary; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), Vol. II, p. 77.

[9] Dhorme, *op. cit.,* p. 155: "La fin ויגד לך reprend textuellement les mots de Sophar (xi, 6). Celui-ci souhaitait une révélation divine. Job le ramène aux voix de la nature."

or meditation. In that case we might translate: "Speak musingly"—a rendering that would imply reasoning on the part of Sophar. Since Job seems to be listing various categories of animated nature as sources of information, a few authors propose the apposite correction of שיח לארץ to זוחלי ארץ, crawling things or reptiles.[10] While this emendation does render the division of the passage more logical and perhaps gives added point to Job's reasoning, there is no foundation in external criticism to make the suggested change. Thus the next source of information listed by Job is the earth, הארץ, although thereby we do understand the various "forms of lower life with which it (the earth) teems."[11] With the fishes of the sea Job exhausts the sources of information in animated creation from which Sophar can obtain the knowledge given in the following verse.

In translating: "Quis ignorat quod omnia haec manus Domini fecerit?" the Vulgate is quite inaccurate. The Massoretic Text preserves the first section of the verse thus: מי לא ירע בכל אלה. These words admit of at least three distinct interpretations: 1) Who does not know by means of all these things? 2) Who (living) among all these things does not know? 3) Which of these does not know? It is true that Job has personified animated creation to some extent. If we understand him to be still employing the figure of personification in this verse, his meaning would naturally be: If the brute animal has this knowledge of God, how much more so should not rational man? However, it is most unlikely that Job resorts to personification now too, for here he speaks not of a physical quality, but of the exercise of the intellectual faculty. These creatures can and do impart information—but passively. In themselves they do not possess that knowledge; they merely bear within themselves the printed message which our intellectual faculty will be able to read by means of reasoning. Hence we rule out the third possibility listed. Either of the other two fits the context and makes good sense.[12] Our preference is for the first listed, in which the phrase is construed instrumentally. Job certainly mentions these voices

[10] Thus Duhm, *ibid.*, Dhorme, *ibid.*, and Ricciotti, *op. cit.*, p. 138 ff.

[11] Davidson-Lancaster, *The Book of Job* (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges; Cambridge: University Press, 1918), p. 106 ff.

[12] Dhorme, *op. cit.*, p. 156; Ricciotti, *ibid.*, prefer possibility 2. Driver-Gray, op. cit., Vol. I, p. 115 lists all three possibilities, but gives preference to the instrumental construction.

of nature for some purpose, which obviously must be cleared up in this verse, if at all. However, in the second interpretation we still are not told, explicitly at least, what their relation to rational man is. In the first we learn that their role is mediatory. These voices of nature are said to impart information, in that by means of them we come to know: כי יד יהוה עשתה זאת. The mention of Yahweh in the mouth of a non-Israelite is more than most editors and critics can bear; hence they would suppress it here, generally changing it to some god-name common to surrounding nations also, such as אלוה. It is entirely possible, even plausible, that originally the text did have such a divine name and that some later Hebrew scribe or copyist inadvertently changed it to Yahweh. But could not this inadvertence have existed on the part of the hagiographer himself, who is after all but a human instrument with human shortcomings?[13] Or could not even a non-Israelite have used the Hebrew divine name Yahweh to mean God, just as we today might speak of Jehovah or Allah as God? The sense of this verse will not vary in the slightest, whether we retain יהוה or make the rationalist-inspired change. Now, the interpretation of this verse rests quite entirely on that of the word זאת which is, to say the least, vague and indeterminate. Here again we encounter a variety of opinions:[14] 1) זאת equals כל אלה of the first stich. In other words, the voices of nature, animated creation, tell us that Yahweh is their creator. 2) זאת refers to v.6, hence taking up again the question of the security of the wicked. 3) זאת has reference to the preceding remarks of Sophar. What his friend had urged that he should learn from direct divine revelation, Job insists one can learn from the voices of nature. Those who hold the first interpretation recur to Isa. 66:2 and Jer. 14:22; the word זאת will refer either to all creation or only to animated creation. We cannot, however, establish the equation זאת = כל אלה; in fact, the difference of number would seem to rule out that possibility. Then, in the second interpretation it would seem that Yahweh merely suffers the wicked to remain secure; in other words, Yahweh's role would be passive. However, the verb עשה calls for some positive action or quality on the part of Yahweh. Any

[13] Davidson-Lancaster, *op. cit.*, p. 107: "The only occurrence ... of the name of Jehovah in the speeches.... It may be a slip on the part of the writer." Cf. also Ricciotti, *op. cit.*, pp. 100, 139.

[14] Driver-Gray, *op. cit.*, p. 115.

interpretation of this verse must take into account the fact that it forms part of Job's answer to his friend. As pointed out above, Job's words in these three verses are directed at Sophar's suggestion that Job learn from divine revelation the various properties of the godhead, specifically divine wisdom and perhaps power. To this suggestion Job now retorts that this—the wisdom and power of God—can be learned from the voices of nature. In other words, it is quite unnecessary to resort to divine revelation; one can obtain some knowledge of God from natural revelation also.[15]

4. DOCTRINE OF THIS PASSAGE

We can now ask the question: What does this passage teach concerning the knowability of God? In our answer we must of course first establish that it definitely has some bearing on the subject of our discussion. Accordingly, we emphasize once more the fact that in this passage there is a clear contrast drawn with divine revelation. In itself this would argue that the sources to be listed are all natural. Actually the sacred author indicates with sufficient evidence that the source of our knowledge of God is natural revelation, or, as Job puts it, the voices of nature, animated creation. Thus whatever this passage should teach concerning God certainly comes within the scope of natural knowledge.

Moreover, from a careful scrutiny of the passage we are certain there is a process of reasoning from effect to cause. Job urges Sophar to study animated creation; through it he will eventually arrive at the Creator. In substance, then, the meaning of the passage is: from creation man can come to know God in a natural way. Job furnishes no further details on the method of eliciting this knowledge from creation. Nevertheless, his words contain a deal more of information which we can obtain with little effort. It is patent that this natural knowledge comes to us through an act of the intellect, to which faculty knowledge is reserved; Job states this fact explicitly when he employs the verb ידע. Further, Job directs his friend to listen to the voices of nature. As he is personifying living creation, we must not take

[15] Budde, *l.c.*: "Der Sinn kann nach dem Zusammenhang nur sein dass Jahwe tun kann und tut, was die Freunde von ihm aussagen (vgl. zuletzt 11,4-11)."

his words at face value. However, because he turns Sophar's attention to these creatures, Job would have to assume his friend's sense of sight trained upon them. Hence, we may say with some certainty that Job implies the operations of the senses in evolving a concept of God. In view of the difference between the *terminus a quo* and the *terminus ad quem*, it is evident that the intellect arrives at this concept through a ratiocinative act. The verb שׂיח, as pointed out above, also seems to imply this.

While from this text we can establish the fact that the book of Job endorses the knowability of God from purely natural sources, still because of the uncertain meaning of זאת in v. 9 there remains no little difficulty in determining just what can be known of God in this manner. According to the more probable opinions, we arrive at knowledge of God's wisdom and power or of his creation of the world. In either interpretation we reach a distinctly divine quality or operation. The terminus of our knowledge is definitely God; our uncertainty regards only the particular aspect of God which Job considers here.

To summarize our findings as pithily as possible, Job 12:7-9 teaches the following: 1) Man can come to know God with the use of his unaided reason. 2) His source of information is animated creation. 3) The process whereby he derives this knowledge is ratiocinative: from the sense-perceptions, which are at least implied, the intellect evolves the notion or concept of the godhead. 4) The terminus of the knowledge thus derived is God, though there is some uncertainty regarding the aspect under which he is considered. 5) To obtain this knowledge is fairly easy, since Job supposes that a mere glance at God's handiwork will teach us.

Therefore, despite the uncertainty of interpretation in v. 9 caused by the word זאת, we cannot afford to neglect this text in any treatment of the knowability of God from natural revelation. Since it is the first passage, chronologically speaking, to deal clearly with this subject, we may say that it has canonized the process of reasoning from creation to Creator. In consequence, all biblical or theological discussions concerning the knowability of God from natural sources should begin from Job 12:7-9.

St. Francis Seminary
Lowell, Massachusetts

MISSAL EPISTLES FROM ROMANS

Rev. Joseph L. Lilly, C.M., S.T.D., S.S.L.

XVI

The following passage is the epistle for the Votive Mass *ad postulandam gratiam bene moriendi* (to petition the favor of dying in the grace of God).

14:7,8 None of us lives to himself, and none dies to himself; for if we live, we live to the Lord, or if we die,
9 we die to the Lord. Therefore, whether we live or die, we are the Lord's. For to this end Christ died and rose again, that he might be Lord both of the dead and of
10 the living. But thou, why dost thou judge thy brother? Or thou, why dost thou despise thy brother? For
11 we shall all stand at the judgment-seat of God; for it is written,

"As I live, says the Lord,
to me every knee shall bend,
and every tongue shall give praise to God."

12 Therefore everyone of us will render an account for himself to God.

The foregoing passage occurs in a section where St. Paul is making a particular application of the principles of Christian charity he has been expounding. The particular situation is that of two groups of the faithful who were inclined to criticize and condemn each other. The one group, designated as "the strong," was composed of the better instructed Christians who had correctly arrived at the conscientious conviction that they were permitted to eat any kind of food or take any kind of drink, since all foods and drink were pure. The other group, designated as "the weak," was made up of the poorly instructed who had arrived at the erroneous conviction that to eat certain foods and take certain drinks was sinful. St. Paul after stating the problem advises them to be patient and understanding towards each other. Each group, he argues, has arrived at its position out of the pure intention of pleasing the Lord. He gives the reason for this in the first part of our passage, and in the latter part he tells them that they should not presume to judge one another.

The meaning of verses 7 and 8 is that no one who has really caught the genuine spirit of Christianity lives a selfish life mere-

ly for the satisfaction of his own whims or for the promotion of his own glory. His entire life and all its activities are dedicated to the Lord and directed to the accomplishment of His will. What holds in regard to the genuine Christian's life and actions, also holds for the last moment of life. As all through life the true Christian belongs to the Lord, so too does he at the moment of death. This maxim, universally accepted by all true Christians, is alleged as proof that both "the weak" and "the strong" have formed their divergent consciences with the one motive of pleasing the Lord.

Here St. Paul is content with stating that both in life and in death the Christian belongs to the Lord. Elsewhere he states the reason: "You have been bought at a great price" (1 Cor. 6:20), and thus the Christian becomes the "slave" (1 Cor. 7:22) of Christ. That relationship gives absolute and exclusive dominion to Christ over the faithful: it extends to both life and death. St. Paul proves this from the death and resurrection of Christ. By His death He acquired supreme dominion over all things; "He humbled Himself becoming obedient unto death, even to death on a cross. Therefore God also has exalted him and given him a name that is above every name" (Phil. 2:8-9). In 2 Cor. 5:15 St. Paul states more explicitly: "Christ died for all, in order that they who are alive may live no longer for themselves, but for him who died for them and rose again."

Thou, why dost thou judge thy brother, or thou, why dost thou despise thy brother? Judgment supposes some kind of superiority of the judge over the judged, but the faithful are all brothers in Christ; none has been put in the superior position to exercise judgment. Another reason for the impropriety of judging one another is that *we shall all stand before the judgment-seat of God.* Many manuscripts here read *Christ* instead of *God,* and elsewhere (2 Cor. 5:10) we read *judgment-seat of Christ.* But as Origen pointed out, there is no difference "because the judgment-seat of God and the judgment-seat of Christ are one and the same according to what the Savior says in the Gospel." There He declares: "All things that the Father has are mine" and when we presume to judge, we are guilty of insolently usurping a function which belongs exclusively to our Lord. Although God has entrusted all judgment to His Son, yet the Father will judge the world with and through the Son.

St. Paul finds the doctrine of universal judgment stated by Isaias whom he quotes freely. Although there is mention only of the worldwide sovereignty of God, that implies judgment, and accordingly the text is aptly applied to universal judgment.

Since therefore everyone is to render an account *for himself,* not for others, each one should look to himself, not be concerned about others, but mind his own affairs. The formidable account which each individual must render to the supreme judge should be a man's great concern. It affords ample material for thought and anxiety.

XVII

The following passage is the Epistle for the Second Sunday of Advent:

15:4 Whatever things have been written, have been written for our instruction, that through the patience and the consolation afforded by the Scriptures we may have
5 hope. May then the God of patience and of comfort grant you to be of one mind towards one another ac-
6 cording to Jesus Christ; that, one in spirit, you may with one mouth glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.
7 Wherefore receive one another, even as Christ has re-
8 ceived you to the honor of God. For I say that Christ Jesus has been a minister of the circumcision in order to show God's fidelity in confirming the promises made
9 to our fathers, but that the Gentiles glorify God because of his mercy, as it is written,

"Therefore will I praise thee among the Gentiles,
And will sing to thy name."

10 And again he says,
"Rejoice, you Gentiles, with his people."

11 And again,
"Praise the Lord, all you Gentiles;
And sing his praises, all you peoples."

12 And again Isaias says,
"There shall be the root of Jesse,
and he who shall arise to rule the Gentiles . . .
in him the Gentiles shall hope."

13 Now may the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that you may abound in hope and in the power of the Holy Spirit.

This passage is in the same context as the preceding Epistle, and forms the conclusion to the entire practical instruction on the various Christian virtues which began with 12:1. From the particular problem of the "strong" and the "weak" Christians, St. Paul merges into the wider horizon of all Christians in general, and makes a plea for unity resulting from the exercise of mutual forbearance. He bases his plea on the example of Christ, who came into the world to receive all mankind, Jews and Gentiles alike, into one great worldwide family.

The opening statement of this liturgical selection is St. Paul's justification for having cited an Old Testament text which, at least in its typical sense, expresses the unselfishness of our Lord. St. Paul might have appealed directly to the example of Christ, but he preferred to find that example stated in the prophetic language of the Old Testament. He assigns the reason for his citing the Old Testament in the opening words of this passage:

Whatever things have been written, have been written for our instruction, that through the patience and the consolation afforded by the Scriptures we may have hope.

This statement is universal and there is no reason to restrict it to the Messianic prophecies. The purpose of the Old Testament as a whole is to instruct the faithful as St. Paul also remarks to Timothy (2 Tim. 3:16). The purport of this instruction is not merely the patient endurance of the trials of life but a certain cheerfulness in suffering. This patience is taught both by the example of the Old Testament saints and by the inspired exhortations of the various hagiographers. Consolation is afforded us by the Scriptures through the promise of divine assistance and of ultimate victory. These, in turn, beget, nourish, and strengthen our hope of eternal life and of the restoration of our bodies—an integral part of the human composite—to us in a transformed condition, endowed with the marvelous properties of agility, clarity and subtlety which St. Paul describes in 1 Cor. 15.

Since these virtues are gifts of God, St. Paul voices the prayer that they may be granted to the Romans. God is styled the God of *patience and comfort,* because it is He who imparts these

graces to men. *To be of one mind towards one another according to Jesus Christ* is to have the same views and opinions, so that in thought and action harmony and concord may prevail. The norm of this unity is the spirit, the example, the teaching and the will of Jesus Christ. Its highest end is the praise of God, which, to be perfect and in accord with the Christian ideal, must proceed from the united hearts and voices of all. This unity is especially characteristic of the Christians in time of prayer (Acts 1:14; 2:46; 4:24). The God who is glorified by the unanimous praise of the Christians is styled *the God and father of our Lord Jesus Christ.* He is the God of Jesus Christ since He is the Creator of His humanity, and His Father in that He begot Him according to the divine nature from all eternity.

If the unanimous glorification of God, for which St. Paul prays in verse 6, is to be a reality, then all the Christians must *receive one another,* i.e., treat one another as brothers, which they really are in Christ. The pattern of how the Christians should treat one another is the manner in which Christ received all men, regardless of race, social status or rank, into His Kingdom, the Church, in order to promote the glory of God.

In what way precisely Jesus was the minister of circumcision is not quite clear. It is either that He confined His earthly ministry to the circumcised, i.e., the Jews, or, more probably, that He realized the promises of the covenant which was sealed by circumcision, and thus confirmed the veracity of God who had promised the Messianic salvation which Jesus accomplished. The Gentiles on the other hand are to glorify and thank God for His mercy. Not that the Jews were not likewise the object of God's mercy, since the original promise was an act of gratuitous mercy on the part of the Almighty, but the Gentiles are the recipients of greater mercy, since in their case there was no promise on which to rely. Since then the Gentiles have been the recipients of such mercy they should show mercy and forbearance towards their fellow Christians.

But although the Gentiles had no promises such as were made to the chosen people, still it was frequently foretold that they would be converted to the knowledge and worship of the one true God. St. Paul cites three such passages. The first is taken from Psalm 17:50, and in its literal sense presents David praising God among the pagan nations he has brought into his kingdom. He is

a figure of our Lord who among the pagan nations praises God and unites them with Himself in that praise through their conversion to Christianity.

The second passage is introduced by *he says*. The subject of this verb is either *God* or the Scriptures of which God is the author. This passage is taken from Deuteronomy 32:43, and represents Moses inviting the pagan nations to join with Israel in the praise and worship of the one true God. The invitation was finally accepted when the Apostles went forth to carry the Gospel message to "the ends of the earth" and win submission to the faith among all the nations.

The third passage is taken from Psalm 116, which is so frequently chanted at the end of Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. This psalm is an invitation to all the nations of the world to unite with Israel in the worship of the true God. The fourth passage is taken from Isaias 11:10, according to the Greek text, which is more a paraphrase than a verbatim translation of the Hebrew. The *root* designates the Messias who was to become the Lord and spiritual ruler of the Gentiles, the object of their hope of eternal salvation.

The last words of the Isaian citation suggest the prayer which St. Paul voices in conclusion of the formal part of the Epistle to the Romans. He sums up the leading ideas of the Epistle: *faith* which gives rise to *hope* of eternal life, in which hope the Christian finds *peace and joy*. He appeals to the *God of hope*, who is so styled because He is the source as well as the object of supernatural hope. And in the words, *in the power of the Holy Spirit*, the apostle indicates the immediate source of the Christian's hope, peace and joy, the Holy Spirit, who dwells in the hearts of the faithful.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

CORRESPONDENCE

Editors:

The projected revision and re-editing of A COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT suggested to me the possibility of presenting some thoughts with regard to this COMMENTARY. I have had the opportunity to use it many times; and I have found it very useful and very helpful. Yet I could not help but think of the average reader, the average Catholic, for whom this work is intended. Have the editors succeeded in giving him or her a work that could be a real aid for the reading and study of the Bible? It was the purpose of the COMMENTARY to view "the needs of the average person who reads the New Testament in English and of organized lay members of Scripture discussion clubs."

With this in mind, then, I began an inquiry. I asked an average college girl to use it; she returned it with a look of helplessness about her. I asked two above-the-average laymen to use it; they did so and found it profitable. But both immediately noted that it appeared too advanced for the ordinary lay person. I asked priests their opinion. Most of them had found it very helpful; but all admitted that it was too far advanced for the average Catholic. Asked why it was too advanced, they were not too clear, but insinuated that the book was too academic, that it was not adapted to the minds of the ordinary laity. So I began a study of the text of the COMMENTARY to determine for myself whether it did suit the needs of the average person. But first of all what are the needs of the average person and of organized lay members of discussion clubs? The average reader who picks up the New Testament as well as the ordinary Catholic who joins a study club wants to learn something about these books; he wants to be able to read the story of our Lord, the epistles of St. Paul and other writers, and to read them with a certain amount of interest and intelligence. So in a Commentary he will be looking for information that will enlighten him with regard to these books; beyond that, he may be somewhat hazy with regard to what he exactly needs. In all probability he has never had a commentary in his hands; hence he does not know how to use one, he does not know how to read in the commentary and transfer what he has learned to the text of the New Testament. The very make-up of a commentary is unknown to him; so he would like to know what the purpose of Special Introduction is, how this will assist him in reading the books of the New Testament.

Keeping in mind then the average reader, I turned to the COMMENTARY. In the Preface the reader is told the reason for the COMMENTARY, and the method in getting it together. It seems to me that a paragraph or two may be added in which the exact way of

using a Commentary as well as the parts of a Commentary would be explained. In the COMMENTARY after the Preface are to be found three articles: The New Testament Background, The Parables of the Gospels, and The Literary Relations of the First Three Gospels. These were carefully read. In themselves these articles are excellent: they are clear, well-written, and give an adequate treatment of the subject. Yet to me they seem too objective, too academic; they do not forge the link between the subject and the New Testament writings. As an example suppose we look at the section (page 8) entitled FROM PILATE TO 70 A.D. The link that is missing would be supplied if the writer had included the books of the New Testament as they appeared during that time. The same applies to the CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE. The third article deals with the Literary Relations of the first three Gospels, or with the Synoptic Problem. The average reader is not aware of significance of this problem, and I doubt whether a discussion of it lends to the value of the COMMENTARY in his eyes. A popular article on the way the Evangelists actually wrote their gospels would seem to be of much more importance; into this could be woven some of the points of the literary problem.

Now let us turn to the actual commentary. First there is the Special Introduction, the significance of which ought to be explained to the ordinary reader. In reading these Introductions I noted how carefully and how completely the subject had been handled; yet there were times when I felt that the various points were presented too logically and too objectively for the ordinary reader; instead of presenting the various points one after another and in academic fashion, suppose they had been vitalized by attempting to recreate (as far as possible) the actual composition of the Gospel or Epistle: would not this be of more profit to the average reader, whose mind is not trained to grasp the logical treatment of subject-matter, point-by-point? Then, too, certain things are presupposed that ought not to be presupposed. For example, in the Introduction to St. Matthew, various names of fathers are introduced, reference ought to be made to the Glossary, where these names are explained. The term "critics" is introduced without a word of explanation. In other places discussions are introduced that seem to be for scholars alone, and not for the ordinary lay reader, for example in the Introduction to the Acts, the section headed THE ACTS AS HISTORY.

But the main point of the COMMENTARY is the actual commentary on the text; and this deserves closer attention. I think that the reader ought to be told at the very outset of the Commentary how to use it: to read the Introduction, then the text of the New Testament, of the book in question, followed by a perusal of the commentary together with the text. Let us take a look at the First Gospel. The

opening words are: "This whole section (chapters 1 and 2) wherein Jesus is shown by his descent and birth to be the Son of David and the Messianic King is proper to Matthew. Luke has a similar prelude at the beginning of his Gospel. But these accounts in the First and the Third Gospel are entirely independent of each other, although in no way contradictory." I am inclined to think that most of this would "go over the head" of an average reader. He does not know the technical significance of "proper"; nor would he understand the significance of "entirely independent of each other . . ." I asked a student in a seminary to explain this latter phrase, and he admitted that he was not sure what it meant. Again, note the last sentence of this Prelude: "In any case the events here narrated are true history and unbelievers lack all objective ground for dismissing them as legendary." The average reader knows nothing of the attacks upon the historicity of these events; hence, it seems useless to make reference to them. I am not inferring that the entire commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew is in a similar vein; it is not. On the whole it is exceptionally well done, considering the desire to be as brief as possible and the many inherent difficulties facing a commentator. But I am pointing out examples of comment that might be changed for the sake of the reader.

The arrangement whereby reference is made to Matthew when a parallel passage is found in Mark and Luke is not as satisfactory as it might be; yet it is not easy to provide an alternative. The only alternative (outside of duplication) would be to comment on the Gospels in chronological order; I suppose that individual taste is to be followed.

I do not desire to make this too long. I have already indicated the main lines of suggestions that I desire to make. In a word, then, it seems to me that the revision should tend to simplify the COMMENTARY as much as possible, keeping in mind at all times the average reader. There is no doubt that the COMMENTARY is an excellent piece of work, and my desire is to see it even better. And I earnestly hope and pray that it will increase the knowledge and love the Word of God.

R. HENRY.

BIBLICAL NEWS

The Catholic Biblical Association of America held its eighth annual meeting at St. Mary's College, Holy Cross, Indiana, August 22 and 23. The meeting was opened with a Mass celebrated by the Most Reverend Edwin V. O'Hara, D.D., chairman of the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine. About sixty members were in attendance to hear the lectures and discussions, high light of which was a most interesting and informative lecture by Dr. William Foxwell Albright of Johns Hopkins University on the Chanaanite Language and Biblical Hebrew. In appreciation of Dr. Albright's gracious generosity he was declared an honorary life member of the Association. There were many other scholarly and well prepared papers on other subjects. Many of these will appear subsequently in the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly,* and a detailed account of the meeting will appear in the January 1945 issue of the *Quarterly.*

At a dinner meeting addresses were made by the President, Very Rev. Donat Poulet, O.M.I., who then introduced Bishop O'Hara, who read a letter from His Excellency, the Apostolic Delegate to the United States. This letter is published in this issue of the Quarterly. The Most Reverend James Kearney, D.D., member of the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, then addressed the meeting, congratulating them on the significant work they had accomplished in the Confraternity New Testament, which served, he said, to introduce the Sacred Scriptures into thousands of homes where they had never been before and to bring home to the faithful the intimate relationship existing between the Sacred Scriptures on the one hand and Catholic Liturgy and doctrine on the other. Sister Madeleva then spoke, outlining the two year course in theology being given at St. Mary's, leading to the degree of Master of Arts in Religion.

The meeting closed with Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament at which Bishop O'Hara was celebrant. The next meeting will be held in New York City, sometime between August 18 and 30, 1945.

The officers elected or re-elected at the meeting are as follows: President, Rev. W. H. McClellan, S.J.; Vice President, Rev. J. G. Hanley; Recording Secretary, Rev. Edward Siegman, C.PP.S.; General Secretary, Rev. J. L. Lilly, C.M.; Assistant General Secretary, Rev. Dominic Unger, O.F.M.Cap.; Treasurer, Rev. J. E. Steinmueller. The Episcopal Committee appointed the Reverend W. S. Reilly and Right Rev. Msgr. Henry Grimmelsman as Consultors, and Rev. G. H. Guyot, C.M. and Rev. Edward Cerny, S.S., were appointed to the Editorial Board of the *Catholic Biblical Quarterly.*

During the period, January to July 1944, 2283 copies of the Commentary on the New Testament were sold. This exhausted the first printing of 20,000 copies. The second printing is now ready for distribution.

A question, which has been raised and discussed from time to time in England for the past fifty years, has recently been raised again: Would it not be a wise plan to take and baptize the Authorized Version for use as our standard translation of the Bible? This query is discussed in the July 1944 issue of *Scripture*, published by the Catholic Biblical Association of England. The answer is not favorable to the proposal. We quote from Rev. E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J., who answers the question in *Scripture:*

> Great as is the importance of beauty of language, the importance of intelligibility is greater, but that of accuracy is paramount. The Authorized Version was made at a time when the knowledge of biblical languages was far less perfect than it is to-day. It is not, therefore, surprising that in the last century it was found to need a drastic revision. Hence the Revised Version of 1881, and it is acknowledged that this is no longer the Authorized Version. It is clear that we cannot take, as it stands, a version acknowledged to be so faulty. And the effort of the revisers, whose work is admitted not to have been a success, is a warning of the impossibility of the manifold correction of a classic without destroying its character.

SURVEY OF PERIODICALS

New Testament

Rev. John J. Collins, S.J., S.S.L.
Rev. Anthony C. Cotter, S.J., S.T.D.

American Ecclesiastical Review, 110, 1944. M. J. Gruenthaner, S.J., "The New Encyclical on Biblical Studies" I (330-7). Continued in 111, 1944 (p. 43-52).

Clergy Review, 24 (1944). A.G.M., "Our Lady's Sister" (47-48). Identification "of Our Lady's sister with Mary of Cleophas cannot lightly be dismissed as devoid of sound reason when authorities of the calibre of Lagrange and Lebreton give it such serious consideration." Lagrange holds four women in Jn. 19:25; Lebreton thinks this probable.

Hugh Pope, O.P., "I Always Read the Authorized Version" (50-60). "A.V. has ... made some three and thirty corrections in the translations then current ... But passages remain which certainly ought to have been changed, at least in R.V."

A.G.M., "Judas in the Gospels" (108-17). The Gospel evidence contradicts Dorothy Sayers' portrayal of Judas in *The Man Born to be King*. Miss Sayers believes "that the sin of Judas was a peculiarly overweening loftiness."

Reginald Fuller, "The English Bible of the Counter-Reformation" (151-8). We "cannot but admire the industry and zeal of our forefathers in providing during the post-Reformation period seventy editions, or at least reprints of the New Testament, four of the Old Testament alone and forty of the entire Bible." The Douay was used by A.V. and many of its renderings were adopted, though without acknowledgment.

Expository Times, 55, 1943. R. Abba, "Jesus—Man or Mediator" (61-5). "The view here advocated is summarized succinctly by Mackintosh: 'It is possible,' he says, 'to conceive the Son, who has entered at love's behest on the region of growth and progress, as now possessing *all* the qualities of Godhead in the form of concentrated potency rather than of full actuality, *dunamei* rather than *energia*.' The kenosis thus becomes a pre-temporal act of self-limitation whereby 'actuality' is reduced to 'potency'; but this kenosis has as its complement a plerosis beginning probably at His baptism and consummated in His resurrection and exaltation to God's right hand. In the course of His human development the Man Jesus appropriates such of these latent powers as are necessary for the fulfillment of His vocation in the world." (64-5).

D. Blair, "Citizenship and Civil Obedience" (80-1). Considers Luther's position. "Luther undoubtedly regarded State idolatry as sinful. But, in his profound regard for State authority, as ordained by God, one may find the grounds of strong temptation in that direction, and perhaps to the practice of a pietism which regards protest against or even active participation on the Christian's part, in political life, a vain and needless impertinence."

D. R. Griffiths, "The Lord is the Spirit" (2 Corinthians 3:17,18) (81-3). Upholds the interpretation: the Lord, i.e., Christ is the Spirit.

E. Basil Redlich, "St. John i-iii: A Study of Dislocations" (89-92). Arguing from codex form and cumulative arguments, the author concludes that 2:13–3:21 was originally after 12:36.

A. E. Garvie, "Suggestive Variants" (95-97). Their value for preaching.

W. Herbert Spencer, "John ix, 3" (110). Suggests a comma instead of a period at the end of 3.

T. Nickling, "Matthew xiv, 12" (110). Instead of "they buried him and went and told Jesus" reads "they buried him. And they (i.e. the Twelve) came and reported to Jesus."

C. S. C. Williams, "Baptism for the Dead" (110). "Was a Marcionite practice as late as the fifth century."

F. F. Bruce, "Baptism for the Dead" (110-11). Defends it as a real practice.

K. Grayston, "The Sower" (138-9). The Sower "was chosen by Jesus because it was a recognized metaphor for God's action in bringing about the New Age." The identification of the Sower with the Son of Man is secondary.

E. F. F. Bishop, "Where was Emmaus? Why not 'Imwas'?" (152-3). Argues for 'Imwas.' The distance of sixteen miles could be walked. Or they may have ridden. "With reasonably responsive donkeys, which should certainly have had a Sabbath rest within the previous forty-eight hours, there is no decisive reason against their not having covered the distance in five hours or perhaps even less."

E. L. Lewis, "A Rhetorical Principle in the Gospels" (166-7). Refers to Dr. Daube's treatment of our Lord's question "Is it lawful on the sabbath to do good, or to do harm?" (Lk. 6:9). It "is possible to hold unless they believed God worked through Jesus that they would have answered, and perhaps as follows. You intend to heal. We know you will heal, but Satan will work through you, for what God forbids to be done on the Sabbath cannot be good. Let him come to be healed on another day."

T. F. Glasson, "Did Matthew and Luke Use a 'Western' Text of Mark?" (180-4). Suggests that Matthew and Luke used "copies of

Mark in which the same corruptions occurred—corruptions which have been transmitted to us in the Western MS. Tradition." The author examines 37 cases; in 20 of them Mt and L agree with D against the text of Mark; in 17 Mt. agrees with D against the text of Mark.

A. Bar, "The Use and Disposal of the Marcan Source in Luke's Passion Narrative" (227-231). Arguing merely from the standpoint of form, the author thinks the Proto-Luke hypothesis is not necessary to account for Luke's narrative of the passion. It is sufficient to say that Luke had before him "Mark and certain additional material descriptive of the last events at Jerusalem," and that he worked the latter into the Marcan scheme.

R. O. P. Taylor, "Form Criticism in the First Centuries" (218-220). Calls the attention of the form critics "to the careful studies of literary form which were made by writers of the first centuries of our era."

R. P. C. Hanson, "A Note on Luke XVI, 14-31." (221-2). Applies the methods of form criticism to this passage to elucidate the connection between the various sayings.

L. O. Bristol, "Paul's Thessalonian Correspondence" (223). Argues that 1 Thess. was written after 2 Thess.

W. H. Baker, "Did Jesus Foresee His Passion?" (249-250). The Synoptics make it clear that Jesus foresaw and foretold His passion. On the other hand, "all the disclosures of our Lord about His death occur in the Gospels after the incident at Caesarea Philippi." Hence some have concluded that He Himself then became aware of the failure of His mission, in disappointment turned to the Cross, and began to prepare the disciples for the shock of His death. This is the opinion the author attacks.

Harvard Theological Review, 37, 1944. Campbell Bonner, "Note on Mark 6,20" (41-4). *Aporein* "when used in philosophical contexts, takes on the meaning 'raise a question' in dialectic, especially a difficult and debatable one. The present passage may be rendered 'after hearing him he was wont to raise many questions, and he took pleasure in hearing him.'"

Homiletic and Pastoral Review, 44, 1944. C. J. Callan, O.P., "The Goodspeed Parallel New Testament" (507-12). A review of Goodspeed's book and a discussion of the principles of translation.

C. J. Callan, O.P. and J. A. McHugh, O.P., "Encyclical on the Promotion of Biblical Studies" (554-8). "A brief summary of the chief points in the Pope's own words under appropriate headings."

Msgr. J. Straubinger, "The Final Restoration of Israel" (734-741). An interpretation of Rom. 11:25-32 in the light of the O.T. prophets.

Irish Ecclesiastical Record, 63, 1944. John A. O'Flynn, L.S.S., "'Divino Afflante Spiritu': The New Encyclical on the Scriptures." (289-300). Examines the main points of the doctrinal part of the Encyclical.

Jewish Quarterly Review, 34, 1944. B. Cohen, "The Relationship of Jewish to Roman Law" (267-280). First part. Treats what has been done on the subject.

J. A. Agus, "Marriage Laws in the Bible and Talmud" (365-8). A critical review of L. M. Epstein's book of that title. The reviewer praises the work, but takes some exceptions.

F. V. Filson, "A History of Early Christian Literature" (369-70). Reviews E. J. Goodspeed's book of that title. On its subject "the one up-to-date work in English."

F. V. Filson, "Marcion and the New Testament" (385-6). A review of John Knox's book. His thesis "is either a revolutionary insight, which will render prevailing views of early Christian literary history antiquated, or it is a serious misinterpretation of that history. I think rather it is such a misinterpretation."

Journal of Bible and Religion, 12, 1944. T. S. Kepler, "The Dilemma Regarding Jesus" (12-6). Suggests the finding of the real Jesus by means of form criticism and the criteria of pragmatism and coherence.

E. W. K. Mould, "Teaching the Life of Jesus" (17-8). The author explains his own method. "For the college undergraduate, the most helpful guiding principle is found in the earliest Gospel itself, Mark 12:37b, 'The common people heard him gladly.'"

W. Scott, "Gospels in a Developing Church" (19-25). The "Gospel proclaimed in the Church was not identical with the primitive Gospel, and it never attained the fixity which might seem desirable and which is so often attributed to New Testament thought."

L. H. Wild, "The Basic Teachings of Jesus" (26-32). Treats the matter in the Synoptics.

S. R. Harlow, "Teaching the Pauline Epistles" (33-5). Explains his own method. Uses much from geography and his travels.

M. E. Lyman, "Teaching the Fourth Gospel" (36-41). Presents recent studies and proposes what she considers should be emphasized today.

C. S. Braden, "Hindu Interpretations of the Bible and Jesus" (42-7). The attitude is for the most part one of appreciation. However, they assimilate many scriptural utterances without foundation to their own peculiar faith.

Journal of Biblical Literature. 63, 1944. L. Mowry. "The Early Circulation of Paul's Letters" (73-86). A discussion of Goodspeed's theory regarding the origin of the earliest *corpus Paulinum.*

E. J. Goodspeed, "Greek Idiom in the Gospels" (87-91). Argues against the theory of a purely Aramaic origin of the Gospels.

A. M. Perry, "Is John an Alexandrian Gospel?" (99-106). Inclines to the view "that the Fourth Gospel and its companion epistles originated in the Alexandrian church."

E. C. Broome, "The Sources of the Fourth Gospel" (107-121). "We can assert that John did use sources, used them somewhat arbitrarily, quoting short *logia* verbatim, modifying, retelling and rephrasing longer sources." The author distinguishes seven sources, partly Greek, partly Aramaic.

I. J. Martin, "Glossolalia in the Apostolic Church" (123-130). Traces "the stages in the development of glossolalia and its place and significance in the life of the first generation of Christians."

O. J. F. Seitz, "Relationship of the Shepherd of Hermas to the Epistle of James" (131-140). Discusses the use of *dipsychos* (double-minded) and its cognates in early Christian literature.

H. B. Downs, "The Peshitto as a Revision: Its Background in Syriac and Greek Texts of Mark" (141-159). Discusses the relation between the Peshitto and the earlier Syriac translation called the Evangelion da-Mepharreshe. The author wishes "to determine whether the Peshitto of Mark was a fresh translation from the Greek or a revision of the Evangelion da-Mapherreshe." His conclusion is that it was a revision. More complicated is a further problem, viz. to determine "the type or types of Greek text to which the MS used in revising the Peshitto is allied."

D. F. Robinson, "A note on Acts 11:27-30" (169-172). Modern criticism identifies the visit of Paul and Barnabas to Jerusalem which is narrated in Acts 11:27-30, with that recorded in Acts 15:1-35 and with the visit described by Paul in Gal. 2:1-10. The author suggests that Acts 11:27-30 be identified with Acts 9:26-30 and Gal. 1:18-24.

G. Amadon, "The Crucifixion Calendar" (177-190). Answers Dr. R. A. Parker's criticism of her lunar theory.

Journal of Near Eastern Studies, 3, 1944. Valentine Muller, "The Prehistory of the 'Good Shepherd'" (87-90). "The Christian Good Shepherd . . . reflects in an exemplary manner the complex development of ancient civilization and the synthetic character of its final phase."

Journal of Religion, 24, 1944. S. Vernon McCasland, "The Demonic 'Confessions' of Jesus" (33-6). The identification of Jesus as Messias was an effort of self-defense on the part of the demons.

P. S. Minear, "Time and the Kingdom" (77-88). We "have failed to comprehend the message of the kingdom because we have forced biblical eschatology into alien categories of time."

Allen Wikgren, "The Targums and the New Testament" (89-95). Shows that work needs to be done on them and believes that they will prove valuable for the NT.

Journal of Theological Studies, 45, 1944. D. Daube, "Three Questions of Form in Matthew V" (21-31). The first question deals with the last of the eight beatitudes, which is longer and more comprehensive than the others. But "there is no reason why so far as form is concerned, we should boggle at a series in which all members are of fairly equal length, except the last, which is longer than the others." As for the second question, "it has been maintained that the form of Matt. V, 17-48 must be Greek. I submit, however, that the possibility of its going back to a Jewish milieu cannot be ruled out." In the third place, the author seeks an explanation for the use of "Amen" as a particle "not confirming a previous statement, but opening a statement and emphasizing its truth and importance," as in Mt. 5:18.

G. O. Williams, "The Baptism in Luke's Gospel" (31-8). To tone down the apparent scandal of Jesus being baptized by John, Luke recasts Mark's account of the incident (L 3:18-22). "John's significance is therefore not that he baptized Jesus, but that in the course of his ministry he bore witness to the approach of a Greater One who was destined to eclipse his own fame."

S. Liberty, "The Importance of Pontius Pilate in Creed and Gospel" (38-56). Why does the formula of baptism oblige the neophyte to profess that Jesus "suffered under Pontius Pilate?" Merely to fix the time of the crucifixion in history? The author thinks it means more. Pilate's judgment "stood both for the Jewish and Gentile convert as a symbol of the great fact that official Judaism had betrayed its own cause by handing over the Christ to the Gentile power, and therefore had forfeited its claim to dictate the terms of salvation to the world."

A. R. George, "The Imperatival Use of *hina* in the N.T." (56-60). Discusses two earlier articles in the same Journal by Drs. C. J. Cadoux and H. G. Meecham.

G. D. Kilpatrick, "Western Text and Original Text in the Epistles" (60-5). "An attempt to apply to the Epistles the argument of an earlier note in the Journal." "No manuscript, no family or textual type presents in all places the true text . . . Hence in the Epistles and Acts just as much as in the Gospels we must pursue an impartial eclecticism."

Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa, 14, 1944. Mgr. Ildebrando Antoniutti, "Allocution" delivered at St. Paul's Seminary of the University of Ottawa on the Fiftieth Anniversary of Providentissimus Deus. (120-2). Many passages from Sacred Scripture and the Fathers. In Latin.

W. L. Newton, "The Providentissimus Deus" (123-6). The encyclical, its causes and effects.

Donat Poulet, O.M.I., "The Divine Authorship of Holy Scripture" (126-32). A Broadcast over the Canadian stations Nov. 7, 1943.

Theological Studies, 5, 1944. J. E. Coleran, S.J., "The Study of Holy Scripture" (86-98). Treats Pope Leo's Encyclical *Providentissimus Deus* and shows its results in "those papal acts and pronouncements which can be said to stem by direct line from *Providentissimus Deus.*"

BOOK REVIEWS

S. N. KRAMER, *Sumerian Mythology,* A Study of Spiritual and Literary Achievement in the Third Millennium B.C. (Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society, Vol. XXI, 1944, Philadelphia). Pp. xiv, 125. Plates 21. Figures 3. $2.00.

Although written by an eminent scholar of Sumerian, this interesting book is intended for the general layman, not primarily for the sumeriologist or assyriologist. According to the preface, this is the first of a planned series of seven volumes and "is largely introductory in character; it contains a detailed description of our sources together with a brief outline of the more significant mythological concepts of the Sumerians as evident from their epics and myths" (p. ix). The specialist will be more interested in the five subsequent volumes which "will consist primarily of source material, that is, they will contain the transliterated texts of the restored Sumerian compositions, together with a translation and commentary as well as the autograph copies of all the pertinent uncopied material in the university Museum" of the University of Pennsylvania, of which Dr. Kramer is an Associate Curator. The seventh volume is to bear the title, *Sumerian Religion: A Comparative Study.*

After an introduction (pp. 1-25) which gives an outline of the history of the discovery and decipherment of the Sumerian tablets and explains the great difficulty of reading and translating Sumerian literary texts, the author treats of the Myths of Origin (pp. 26-75), the Myths of Kur (the Nether World; pp. 76-96), and three other Myths (pp. 97-103). Valuable Notes and index complete the volume.

Only a few and comparatively small extracts from these Myths are given in transliterated Sumerian, and it would be almost impossible, even for an expert, to read much on the samples of the original texts that are here reproduced, even though, as photographs, they are excellent. However, many lengthy selections in a reliable English translation are presented. Judging from these, one finds it hard to share in the author's enthusiasm for these Sumerian poems, considered merely as literary compositions. To a modern reader their long and numerous repetitions make them seem very tedious; but perhaps the ancient Sumerians did not ordinarily read them privately but heard them sung in sacred pagentry where the choral refrains naturally led to repetitions. Certainly, the later Babylonians and Assyrians, who borrowed from this older material *in extenso*, far surpassed their predecessors in literary skill. Yet, no one will try to rob the Sumerians of their laurels as originators, for, since these texts were written about the year 2000 B.C. and are based on even older written documents, they form "the oldest written literature of any significant amount ever uncovered" (p. viii).

As to the subject-matter itself of these Myths, the author is no doubt right in saying:

> It cannot be sufficiently stressed that the Sumerian cosmogonic concepts, early as they are, are by no means *primitive*. They reflect the mature thought and reason of the thinking Sumerian as he contemplated the forces of nature and the character of his own existence. When these concepts are analyzed, when the theological cloak and polytheistic trappings are removed (*although this is by no means always possible at present because of the limited character of our material as well as of our understanding and interpretation of its contents*), the Sumerian creation concepts indicate a keenly observing mentality as well as an ability to draw and formulate pertinent conclusions from the data observed.

Space here does not permit even an outline of these concepts. But the biblical scholar would probably be interested in the question of the possible relationship of these Myths and the Hebrew account of the origin of the world. Suffice it to say, that any possibility of a direct borrowing is quite excluded, for the Hebrews never came into direct contact with Sumerian culture, and the Hebrew scribe, unlike his Babylonian brother, took no antiquarian interest in the documents of a language that was dead even then for a good millennium and was entirely different from his own. Even the possibility of indirect *literary* borrowing, via the Accadic and the Canaanite or the Hurrian, to explain some seeming similarities in certain minor details, can well be excluded. For such concepts as the struggle between the orderly forces of nature and the primordial chaos, the solid "firmament" that holds back the upper waters from the waters beneath the earth, the annual death and resurrection of vegetation in the dry and in the

rainy seasons, etc., formed the common cultural background of the whole Ancient Near East. Fundamentally considered, the biblical cosmogony differs *toto caelo* (in an entirely literal sense) from that of all their neighbors and cannot be explained as a merely natural development, apart from divine revelation.

The author does not discuss this question here, leaving it presumably for his concluding volume. But it is to be hoped that he will then tread very warily on the slippery ground of Comparative Religion, a study that can easily degenerate into a pseudo-science based on a little knowledge of a few superficial resemblances and a great ignorance of vast and profound differences. In this volume there is only one statement which, despite the author's obvious intention of not being irreverent, still strikes a believing Christian, who really knows the fundamental Catholic doctrine on the Blessed Trinity and the Incarnation, as offensive. On pp. 74-75 we read,

> *Enlil*, the air-god, now found himself living in utter darkness, with the sky, which may have been conceived by the Sumerians as made of pitch-dark lapis lazuli, forming the ceiling and walls of his house, and the surface of the earth, its floor. He therefore begot the moon-god *Nanna* to brighten the darkness of his house. The moon-god *Nanna* in turn begot the sun-god *Utu*, who became brighter than his father. It is not without interest to note here that the idea that the son, the begotten one, becomes stronger than the father, the begetter—in a deeper sense this is actually what happens in the development which we term *progress*—is native to the philosophy and psychology of the Near East. *Enlil*, the air-god, for example, becomes in historical times more powerful than his father *An*, the heaven-god. At a later date *Marduk*, the god of the Semitic Babylonians, becomes more powerful than his father Enki, the water-god. In the Christian dogma, Christ, the son [*sic!*], becomes in many ways more significant and pertinent for man and his salvation than God, the father.

Dr. Kramer is to be congratulated for undertaking so arduous and discouraging a task as the publication of Sumerian religious texts, and the assyriologist eagerly awaits the next five volumes which are to contain the publication of more than 800 new tablets and fragments of such material, which, in the author's not too excessive boast, "furnishes new, rich and unexpected source material to the archaeologist and anthropologist, to the ethnologist and the student of folklore, to the students of the history of religion and of the history of literature" (p. viii).

LOUIS HARTMAN, C.SS.R.

WRIGHT, G. ERNEST, *The Challenge of Israel's Faith* (U. of Chicago Press: 1944). Pp. ix, 108. $1.50.

This is an eloquent protest against the neglect into which the Old Testament has fallen, and an attempt to present the central themes

of Israelite faith as of value for present day readers. It is one of the most invigorating books to appear in some time. The author is professor of Old Testament history at the McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago, and his little book is exactly the kind of book one would expect a good Protestant to write, and apparently he is a very good Protestant.

He protests against the way preachers use the Scripture, "going to it, not to be taught by it, not to find in it criticism of their religion or of their system, but simply to find illustrations of this point or that" (p. 102). He protests against a diminishing use of the Old Testament, which deserves a much closer scrutiny. He protests (and how rightly!) against the kind of grammatical, linguistic, historical approach to the Bible that leaves the student unmoved, unreformed, and worst of all, ignorant of "the Word behind the words" (p. 13). He wants us to stop evading the issues, to study the unequivocal, clear-cut theology of the prophets, to face ourselves in the light of divine facts. God has made himself known, he says (and it is his theme), not primarily in ideas, but in events (p. 101).

We shall now bring up and insist somewhat on certain points, not because of any desire for destructive criticism on our part, but because these things are in our opinion defects which impair the value of what is otherwise an excellent, provocative book.

In the first place, it seems that inspiration is not a theological notion, but should rather be essentially emotional; the inspired book inspires readers (pp. 13-14). Thus an interesting equation is set up: Christ: Moses :: Luther : Christ. For Jesus, the Scriptures were authoritative and the word of God, "but at the same time he was able to pick and to choose and to add. There was in him an inner certainty about eternal truth which enabled him to use the written law as his authority and at the same time to be its critic. Turning to Martin Luther, we find the very same situation... Both approached the Bible by way of inward experience... 'Conscience is between us and the Bible—a conscience which it may be a duty to enlighten, but not a duty to disobey because God speaks to us through it'" (pp. 100-12 *passim*). One finds oneself curious whether the next step will not logically terminate the equation with: as I to Luther, that is, that we too should choose what we would from the Scriptures, which would lead us once more to a private interpretation without the hindrance of any external restrictions.

It is not as if we Catholics are uninterested in what the Word of God is for us right now; the contrary is true. We believe firmly that "All scripture is inspired by God, and useful for teaching, for reproving, for correcting, for instructing in justice; that the man of God may be perfect, equipped for every good work" (2 Tim. 3:16-17). But the Bible is not self-explanatory, nor does it constitute by itself a

rule of Faith. Without the restrictions, and they are both few and utterly logical, besides being theological, interpretation will most certainly go awry.

It seems too that Mr. Wright here, implicitly at least, adores a sort of freedom, infinite freedom. This freedom is a wonderful thing; we want it too, but we adore God and reverence His Church. He however wants to know "how can we be sure the Church tells us the truth. Because of the witness of the Scripture? And then believe the Scripture on the authority of the Church? The author will have none of this vicious circle (p. 8)—and who would blame him—especially in view of the fact that "the Catholic church and all religious organizations have been guilty far too often of dogmatically claiming that the Bible says what we now know it does not say" (*ibid*). What these false dogmatic claims are is not stated.

The reviewer also got the impression that Mr. Wright does not think too highly of ritual (e.g., pp. 42-44), although he concedes that the differences between the prophetic and priestly attitude in this regard can be exaggerated out of due proportion. To preserve that proportion, then, it should be stated that if ritual were to lead men to hate good and love evil (as opposed to "the essence of the Law according to the prophets" (Amos 5:15), i.e., to walk humbly before the Lord, hating evil and loving good), then it would be intrinsically evil and a thing to be pitilessly condemned. Actually of course it does no such thing. Ritual and the gestures of religious worship are not the goal of religion, but they are a *minimum* of all religion. They are accidentals which safeguard the substance. Not to be exaggerated, neither are they to be minimized. Men cannot worship God as spirits, but only as men.

"Most of us today who are trying to be good Christian theists, believing in the living, intervening, personal God ... actually live as though we were deists, really believing that God will not enter the details of daily life" (p. 55). It is refreshing to hear one outside the Church speaking so earnestly and definitely about God and His rights. The author believes that perhaps the secret of the vitality of Old Testament prophetic religion lay in its vivid anthropomorphism, and that we could use more of it today as a true answer to modern deism. There is indeed little in an abstract principle, or "God-idea," to stir the emotions or strike at the will (p. 67). But, then, is not ritual a kind of dramatic anthropomorphism? Why limit it to fragile words, when actions speak more loudly still when they are really a reflection of words?

The Challenge of Israel's Faith is the challenge of a personal but now superseded religion; the challenge of Catholicism is that of a living Faith. These two things are not contradictory, for actually

nothing is more intensely personal than living Catholicism, which alone has fulfilled in it the promises made to Israel.

RICHARD T. MURPHY, O.P.

BRUCE M. METZGER. *The Saturday and Sunday Lessons from Luke in the Greek Gospel Lectionary.* Studies in the Lectionary Text of the Greek New Testament. Volume II. Number 3. University of Chicago Press. 1944. Pp. 101. $1.50.

The present book contains substantially two chapters of the author's doctoral dissertation submitted in 1942 to the Classics Department of Princeton University. Realizing the value of the work not only for the field of Classics, but also for that of Scripture, Dean Colwell has now incorporated these chapters in the valuable *Studies in the Lectionary Text of the Greek New Testament.*

In order that the reader may be able to judge the value of the work the author carefully explains his method of procedure. Because the text of the lectionaries varies from almost complete uniformity with the Textus Receptus to a striking agreement with the text of the early uncials, necessity caused the work to be restricted to a distinct section in the lectionary system. The choice was fixed upon the Saturday and Sunday lessons from St. Luke. Two considerations here came into play. First, no investigation of these lessons has hitherto been made, and second, more material was available for this section of the lectionary text than for certain other sections. In addition the area of investigation was further limited by choosing two sample lections, Luke 6:1-10 (4th Sat.) and Luke 8:41-56 (7th Sun.).

Next for the material of collation and the texts against which they were to be collated. Thanks in large part to previous labors of Dean Colwell, 14 lectionary Mss. were collated. As a check on the reliability of the text derived from the 14 manuscripts, the reading of 58 other lectionary manuscripts were available for Luke 16:19-31.

In regard to the text against which these lectionaries were collated, Metzger decided that the least objectionable representative of the Byzantine text is the Textus Receptus. For the Caesarean text the matter is more complicated, but the author follows Lagrange, the Lakes and particularly Ayuso in his article in *Biblica,* XVI (1935), 369-415, and distinguished a pre-Caesarean and Caesarean text. The pre-Caesarean is represented by P 45, W, fam 1, fam 13 and 28, and was localized in the Fayyum and Gizeh in Egypt. The Caesarean text itself is represented by Theta, 565, 700, Origen, Eusebius, Sinaitic Syriac, Old Armenian and Old Georgian, and emanated from Caesarea. Metzger's treatment of the Caesarean text is one of the most interesting parts of the book. We will look forward eagerly to his forthcoming article on that subject in the *Journal of Biblical Literature.*

The conclusions of the comparison with the various texts give these results. Neutral readings in the Saturday lesson, 14 per cent; in the Sunday lesson, 18 per cent. Western readings in the Saturday lesson, 7 per cent; in the Sunday lesson, 11 per cent. Pre-Caesarean in the Saturday lesson, 70 per cent; in the Sunday lesson, 70 per cent. Caesarean proper in the Saturday lesson, 55 per cent; and in the Sunday lesson, 60 per cent. This striking likeness to the Caesarean text is further confirmed by three distinctive variants all of which are pre-Caesarean.

From this data the author is quite justified in concluding that one who desires to find the origin of the Byzantine order of the Saturday and Sunday lectionary will do well to look for a locality which used a New Testament with a Caesarean or more precisely a pre-Caesarean type of text in Luke.

Congratulations are due to the author on his labor and scholarly method and to the editors for their latest production in this specialized field of textual criticism.

JOHN J. COLLINS, S.J.

W. A. CURTIS, *Jesus Christ The Teacher.* A Study of his Method and Message based mainly on the Earlier Gospels. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1943). Pp. 260.

The subtitle indicates the two main parts of the volume, the first of which entitled, "The Teacher at Work," gives the background of Christ's ministry and his method. The second, "Themes of the Teaching," contains the main topics of His message. In Part III: "The Teaching and the Church," the author sketches the attitude of Christians in the past and in the present to Christ's message.

In the opening chapters the author shows Christ as a master of S. Scripture, not as a result of attendance at the rabbinical schools, but through his own private study and reflections. This is followed by a sketch of the religious movements of His period, the last of which was that of John the Baptist. Christ's mission is considered a continuation and development of the "Baptist Revival." Another necessary preliminary to Christ's public life is to show His attitude to the Temple, Prayer, Asceticism. In the remainder of Part I Christ's form and method of teaching are outlined and treated.

The body of the work deals with the themes of Christ's teaching, which are treated in ten chapters. Both the choice of themes and their treatment are determined by the author's biblical and religious views. He follows the modern Protestant school of biblical criticism and though he states (p. 5) that he is conservative in his historical estimate of the Gospels, he admits the historicity of neither the infancy section nor the Gospel narratives of Christ's resurrection and

apparitions. Consequently chapter XI treating of the "Risen Life" cannot and does not contain even allusions to the historical facts of Christ's resurrection and apparitions. Found likewise in the preface is the statement that the author is liberal in his interpretation of the Gospels. This attitude is followed in imitation of Jesus, who likewise, according to the author, had been liberal in rejecting scriptural passages and established institutions.

In his religious views he follows the minimum required by any of the various Protestant sects. To him Jesus is a purely human being. Whatever doctrinal views flow from the divinity of Christ are in consequence denied. Not being divine in nature, Christ's death had no real redemptive value for mankind, its merit consisting in its being an exemplification of His doctrine. Though he admits two sacraments, the author maintains the institution of the priesthood as being subsequent to the time of Christ.

Since these biblical and doctrinal views run through the entire volume, all Roman Catholic readers and very many of the author's own fellow-Protestants will find the very core of the work, which presents the themes of Christ's teaching, wholly unacceptable. In vain they will search for even one substantial doctrine which will entitle Jesus Christ to the position he holds as teacher in the Christian world. Of the ten chapters, for instance, which purport to offer Christ's themes of teaching, three are devoted to the teacher, not to the teaching, dealing with Christ's names: Son of Man and Son of God. Following are two chapters treating of Christ's death and risen life respectively. Neither of these contains anything that can properly be classified under "themes of teaching." The final three chapters, Life and Destiny of Man, The Blessed Life, The Church, contain nothing distinctive of Christianity when compared with Judaism. It is, therefore, the contents of the first two chapters: God the Sovereign Father and The Kingdom or Rule of God, which entitle Christ to His unique position among the religious teachers of the world. It is strange that the author, emasculating the teaching of Christ, denying some doctrines attributed to Christ, the greatest of all teachers by his own fellow-Protestants, and others attributed to Him by the Roman Caholic Church (thus constantly detracting from and minimizing Christ's dignity as teacher), fails to use the axe in the one spot where he can and should justly use it. Instead of using it, he overemphasizes the teaching of Jesus on these points, thus creating the false impression that the Fatherhood of God is a doctrine unknown in the Old Testament, and that Christ is its originator. If Judaism and Christianity were properly compared, one can say at most that Christ emphasized and gave prominence to the doctrine. Likewise, in regard to the theme, Kingdom and Rule of God, the reader is left in a maze as to Christ's

actual contribution, since that theme, a fundamental idea without which there can be no religion whatever, was taught in Judaism, in fact, it is as old as man himself. Christ's claim to the title of teacher, therefore, judging from the evidence offered in this volume, rests upon His having *given prominence* to a latent idea of the Old Testament (Fatherhood of God) and, secondly, to His having *coined a new phrase,* the Kingdom or Rule of God, for a truth that existed and was acknowledged to exist ever since God forbade our first parents to eat of the tree in paradise.

The conclusion the reviewer arrived at after reading these ten chapters is that Christ's only positive contribution appears to be the above-mentioned. His chief contribution was negative in character, He having purified Judaism of its out-moded beliefs and practices. A single citation from the author will verify these statements: "Since Jesus would not and did not circumscribe the operations of that liberty which He Himself exercised to the full, would not legislate or dictate a new Law, a new ritual, a new doctrine, a new organization and polity and discipline, but chose to found a brotherhood, to inspire a personal faith, to inaugurate an unseen Kingdom, to enunciate principles, to preach the Gospel, to bequeath an Example and a living Spirit, all Church and orders of ministry must be judged, must stand or fall, by their adherence and fidelity to these vital things" (page 205).

If Part II will prove disappointing to the majority of thoughtful readers, Part III will be found to be positively offensive to Catholics. In justice to the author, it is not merely the Roman Catholic Church that is singled out. Following the thoughts contained in the citation given above, the author bitterly criticizes *all* religions for their organization, authority, system of belief and above all for their unloyalty to the doctrine of Christ. His criticism of the Catholic Church is exceptionally severe.

The volume in its entirety, therefore, cannot be recommended to Catholic readers.

CHRISTOPHER REHWINKEL, O.F.M.